UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

*Official Records*

FIRST COMMITTEE
42nd meeting
held on
Monday, 8 March 1992
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 42nd MEETING

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Chairman: | Mr. ELARABY | (Egypt) |
| later: | Mr. SUH (Vice-Chairman) | (Republic of Korea) |
| later: | Mr. ELARABY (Chairman) | (Egypt) |
| later: | Mr. PATOKALLIO (Vice-Chairman) | (Finland) |
| later: | Mr. ELARABY (Chairman) | (Egypt) |

CONTENTS

- Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session [63]
- General exchange of views
- Programme of work

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

93-85391 3879V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.42
20 April 1993

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 63 (continued)

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION (A/47/887 and Add. 1 and 2, A/47/902; A/C.1/47/14)

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform the Committee that I have received from Geneva a letter from Ms. Edith Ballantyne transmitting a message to the delegations at the resumed session of the First Committee of the General Assembly from the Women's Gathering to Mark International Women's Day. The texts of the letter and the message are available at the table situated at the back of this Conference Room.

I have also received a communication from Mr. Vernon Nichols, Chairman of the NGO Committee on Disarmament, Inc., which contains a statement by that Committee and the Special NGO Committee for Disarmament. It is also available at the table situated at the back of this Conference Room.

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

Mr. AKSIN (Turkey): It is a great pleasure for my delegation to see you, Sir, presiding once again over the First Committee. Your outstanding performance while conducting our work during the fall session of the General Assembly ensures the successful outcome of our deliberations this week.

The end of the cold war has produced a number of changes in the area of international security. Although the international environment now offers new opportunities for further progress in arms control and disarmament within the global framework of maintaining peace and security, it also poses new challenges which require a process of adaptation and revision of the machinery and the experience that the international community has accumulated during the cold war era. In this process, the United Nations disarmament machinery must be given priority so that it will be in line with the new realities.

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

The present disarmament machinery, if it is fully used, is equipped with enough instruments with distinct but complementary interrelated functions. we fully agree with the Secretary-General that we need a coordinated system which would allow the international community to address major disarmament problems promptly, flexibly and efficiently.

We regard the First Committee as the main multilateral forum for the consideration of all disarmament and arms control issues. Through its resolutions, especially those adopted by consensus, the First Committee allows the international community to identify its priorities on the disarmament and international security agenda. The international arms register established in conformity with resolution 46/36 L demonstrates that this Committee is also able to make concrete contributions to arms regulation efforts.

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

By combining the debates on disarmament and international security issues, the First Committee has successfully implemented its rationalization programme. We feel, however, that further streamlining efforts are required. We believe that a serious examination of its agenda will allow the Committee to reduce substantially the number of agenda items. This in turn will reduce the number of resolutions, thus permitting us to concentrate our deliberations on priority issues. The practice of taking up some items once every two or three years would also help to rationalize the Committee's work.

As a deliberative body, the Disarmament Commission offers the possibility for all Members of the United Nations to discuss a selected number of items for the purpose of formulating principles and guidelines for arms control and disarmament. It provides an open forum to Member States for detailed discussions on specific disarmament topics. Its recommendations, reflecting the consensus of a universal membership, are an uncontested and solid framework for the deliberations of other arms-control negotiating bodies and can be used a a reference for bilateral, regional or multilateral disarmament negotiations. The reform programme adopted in 1990 has had a positive and constructive impact on the work of the Commission. In this context, we believe that the Commission should be encouraged to make more concrete recommendations. For this, the member countries should accept that consensus means compromise and requires a certain degree of flexibility. We are of the opinion that a three-item phased agenda can give to member countries, and especially to those which participate with limited delegations in the work of the Commission, opportunities to make a more comprehensive contribution.

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

If we do not consider the Ten Nations Committee on Disarmament, which disappeared in one year, the creation of the Conference on Disarmament dates back to the 1960s. By its resolution 1660 (XVI) of 28 November 1961, the General Assembly, after noting that the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America were desirous of renewing disarmament negotiations in an appropriate body, asked the two Governments to reach agreement on the composition of a negotiating body which both they and the majority of the world could regard as satisfactory.

The Conference on Disarmament, which came to life in 1962 as the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, after three expansions acquired its current name in 1984.

It is worth remembering that the Conference on Disarmament, the only permanent multilateral body for the negotiation of arms control and disarmament agreements, last revised its composition in 1978, at a time when East-West rivalry was very intense. An informal paper, dated 8 December 1992 and prepared by the Secretariat of the Conference, states that:

> "It should be noted that each expansion was in response to certain political conditions. In no case its size and the relative influence of either political or geographical criteria was determined a priori. Once expansion became politically necessary, names of candidates were discussed and in the process of consultations an acceptable balance developed."

We strongly believe that it is high time for the Conference on Disarmament to pause for another reflection exercise. The Conference should recognize the profound changes that have occurred in the international arena

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

and the necessity to adapt itself to these changes. In the course of this exercise, the composition of the Conference merits high priority. The radical and far-reaching developments taking place in the world compel us to look for a much wider participation and burden-sharing in the Conference if our objective is to work out comprehensive disarmament programmes with universal participation. The Conference should accept the applications of countries which are ready and eager to contribute to its deliberations. Views in favour of defending the status quo or limiting the numbers of participants for the sake of effectiveness and efficiency are no longer tenable.

We welcome the decision of the Conference on Disarmament to appoint two Special Coordinators to review the issue of its agenda and its membership. Paragraphs 14 and 16 of annex II of the report circulated as General Assembly document A/C.1/47/14 indicate that the consultations of the Special Coordinator in charge of the membership will continue with the aim of producing an agreed revised proposal for a new composition of the Conference, and the Conference is intended to report to the General Assembly on the result of its deliberations on these questions at the end of its 1993 session. We are fully confident that the Conference will not fail to use fully the momentum created by the successful conclusion of the chemical weapons Convention and take the right decision to review its agenda and expand its composition.

I take this opportunity to recall that Turkey submitted its formal application for Conference on Disarmament membership as early as 1982. I do not have to recall that Turkey is a country with an important military establishment. Turkey is located in one of the critical regions of the world

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

adjoining the Balkans, the Caucasus and the Middle East. It has taken a keen interest in disarmament efforts and participated actively in the negotiations on the reduction of conventional forces in Europe (CFE). Turkey is in a unique position to make a very substantive contribution to the work of the Conference. Against this background, Turkey is convinced that it should take part in the work of the Conference on Disarmament as a full member and expects its application to be given a favourable response this time.

The Charter of the United Nations confers on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. At its meeting at the level of Heads of State or Government on 31 January 1992, the members of the Security Council expressed their commitment to take concrete steps to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations in fields of disarmament and arms control. They also committed themselves to work to prevent the spread of technology related to the research for or production of weapons and to take appropriate action to that end. We believe that the Security Council can play an important role, especially in the field of nuclear non-proliferation.

Finally, a few comments on the Office of Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat. The Office is making a valuable contribution to the work of the United Nations in the field of arms control and disarmament. Implementation and eventual expansion of the Register of Conventional Arms will likely increase its task and responsibilities. We believe that, during the restructuring of the United Nations Secretariat, due attention will be paid to the important role of this Office.

In conclusion, we believe that the time is ripe for the United Nations to revise and reassess its machinery in the field of disarmament and arms control

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

with a view to adapting them to the changing political landscape. My delegation stands ready to contribute in a constructive spirit to these efforts and to the proceedings of this resumed session of the First Committee.

Mr. ZAKI (Pakistan): I should like to express the happiness of my delegation at the reconvening of the First Committee in order to discuss the report of the Secretary-General entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era". We are confident that, under your able chairmanship, Sir, the outcome of the resumed session will be fruitful and that we will achieve positive results.

Pakistan's views on the Secretary-General's report have already been communicated to the Secretariat. As a member of the Conference on Disarmament, Pakistan has also associated itself with the result of the Conference on Disarmament on the Secretary-General's report which has been presented today. We would, however, like to take this opportunity to highlight some aspects of the Secretary-General's report which, in our view, deserve particular attention.

The historic changes in the international political climate and the evolving world situation have, with some exceptions, provided us with an unprecedented opportunity to pursue the process of global disarmament, so that a truly just and equitable system of international peace and security, based on mutual trust and confidence among States, is established.*

---

* Mr. Suh (Republic of Korea), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Zaki, Pakistan)

Disarmament is possible where insecurity has been eliminated. It is equally true that disarmament itself can contribute to reducing tension. It is therefore essential that our commitment to achieving disarmament should be strengthened, and we should stress its various aspects with renewed resolve and a heightened sense of urgency.

The three objectives spelt out in the Secretary-General's report - integration, globalization and revitalization - can serve as useful indicators in the pursuit of our ultimate common goal, which is general and complete disarmament. We should focus our attention on each of these objectives. The creation of conditions favourable for the implementation of effective disarmament measures is dependent on the establishment of a framework which ensures the security of all States, irrespective of their size or strength. The United Nations Charter enshrines basic principles which must continue to guide future endeavours of the international community in its collective undertakings, whether in promoting disarmament or in encouraging preventive diplomacy by the United Nations.

In elaborating the concepts associated with the term "arms regulation", further discussions need to take into account the distinction between arms regulation and disarmament. In the recent peace-keeping, peacemaking and peace-building role of the United Nations, arms regulation has taken the form of either preventing armaments from reaching an aggressor engaged in an armed conflict or seeking to disarm parties to an internal conflict. Disarmament, on the other hand, is a subject with clearly defined objectives in which the established priorities continue to remain valid. Nevertheless, progress achieved in important areas, particularly nuclear and conventional disarmament

(Mr. Zaki, Pakistan)

measures between big Powers, underscores the necessity of moving forward in other areas, such as regional disarmament.

The concept of integration thus requires an approach which seeks to set in motion a process of global disarmament in the nuclear as well as the conventional fields, with equal emphasis placed on regional confidence-building, non-proliferation and disarmament measures in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

In discussing globalization, the Secretary-General's report refers to reciprocated unilateral measures adopted by the United States and the Russian Federation, which resulted in the reduction of their respective nuclear-weapon arsenals. We strongly believe that such measures are not only possible but also desirable at the regional and subregional levels as well. However, in cases where there are vast military imbalances, the main responsibility rests with the country having the greater military capability and arsenals for creating a climate of confidence to make progress on disarmament.

We welcome the recognition in the Secretary-General's report that the trend towards regional approaches to disarmament and confidence-building measures "is to be encouraged" (A/C.1/47/7, para. 16) and that there are

> "numerous ways in which regional approaches could enhance the process of global arms reduction". (ibid.)

This is essentially relevant to the South Asian region, where Pakistan has, over the years, made a number of proposals for the establishemnt of an equitable and non-discriminatory regime that would help in keeping South Asia free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

Since 1974 Pakistan's proposal for a nuclear-free zone in South Asia has been repeatedly endorsed by the General Assembly. In June 1991 the

(Mr. Zaki, Pakistan)

Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Mohammad Nawaz Sharif, proposed the convening of five-nation consultations between the United States, the Russian Federation, China, Pakistan and India to ensure nuclear non-proliferation and establish a nuclear-free zone in South Asia. This proposal has been supported by four of the five proposed participants and welcomed by the world community. We sincerely hope that the one country which has not agreed so far will also take a positive view.

Pakistan also places great importance on furthering the reduction and control of conventional weapons, both globally and at the regioanl level. It is a well-established fact that serious imbalances in conventional forces in any region enhance the sense of insecurity and make both conventional-arms regulation and disarmament, as well as nuclear non-proliferation, difficult. We have thus proposed several measures for arms reduction and disarmament in South Asia, including an agreement between India and Pakistan on a mutually agreed reduction of conventional forces to the lowest level of armaments consistent with security needs.

The Secretary-General's report reflects on certain aspects of conventional-arms control: arms transfers, transparency and other confidence-building measures. While fully agreeing with the observation that

> "Production overcapacities and surplus equipment in industrialized States are now increasingly feeding arms markets in parts of the developing world", (A/C.1/47/7, para. 30)

we believe that arms-producing countries should undertake both to reduce such production and to regulate and restrict the transfer and sale of armaments to other countries. Arms transfers have links with indigenous production

(Mr. Zaki, Pakistan)

capability. Such transfers either heighten an imbalance in military capability or ameliorate an existing imbalance. Restraints on arms transfers should reduce but not heighten the imbalance in certain regions, which would in turn only heighten insecurity and bring closer the threat of conflict.

We agree with the Secretary-General's assessment that our goal must remain to cross the threshold of the post-nuclear-weapon age. The international community has already taken steps towards the elimination of two types of weapons of mass destruction - biological and chemical - and it is time we focused our attention on the total destruction of nuclear weapons and their elimination from the face of the Earth. We welcome the moratorium on nuclear testing announced by certain nuclear Powers. We believe that, while a test ban will check the qualitative development of nuclear weapons and reduce the dangers of nuclear proliferation, our aim should be the adoption of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, a goal which the world community has sought for almost 30 years.

More importantly, pending complete nuclear disarmament, nuclear-weapon States are under an obligation to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. These assurances should be extended to all non-nuclear-weapon States in an unconditional and legally binding manner.

Nuclear non-proliferation would be readily accepted if it were pursued in an equitable and non-discriminatory manner. The disparity and inequality between the nuclear and non-nuclear States in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is well-acknowledged. However, this difference should not be further aggravaed by an arbitrary and selective interpretation of the requirements imposed by the NPT on its parties.

(Mr. Zaki, Pakistan)

Progress towards nuclear disarmament would certainly be a major consideration at the NPT extension conference, scheduled for 1995.

The verification process is the linchpin of all disarmament agreements and is imperative for ensuring the implementation of agreements, particularly those relating to weapons of mass destruction. We are firmly of the view that the United Nations must assume a central role, in both verification and the implementation of disarmament agreements. The United Nations policy in these fields must, however, be determined in a transparent manner on an equitable and non-discriminatory basis.

(Mr. Zaki, Pakistan)

The functioning of the Security Council has been the subject of increased attention in recent years. We welcome the revitalization of the Security Council, which has enabled it to function more effectively. However, the full realization of the Security Council's role, as envisioned in the Charter, for the maintenance of international peace and security through uniform application of the provisions of the Charter, is crucial to promoting conditions of global peace and security before the Council can exercise new responsibilities with respect to promoting the goals and objectives of disarmament.

Today we have heard that the Secretary-General is considering some proposals relating to a reform of the multilateral disarmament machinery. Any change, if it is for the better, should be welcomed. We welcome the move to rationalize the agenda and the work of the First Committee. However, we must ensure that the First Committee is not unduly burdened with issues that would detract from its primary responsibility to address questions related to disarmament and international security.

On the proposed move of the Office of Disarmament Affairs from New York to Geneva, the Pakistan delegation is of the view that the issue should be handled with extreme caution. One of the primary functions of the Office of Disarmament Affairs is to service the First Committee, the main forum for deliberating disarmament and security issues. Its presence in New York facilitates continuous interaction among Member States, relevant non-governmental organizations and the Secretariat. As the United Nations gets more and more involved in arms-regulation and disarmament matters, it would be more logical functionally that the concerned department of the Secretariat should remain at Headquaters, where all United Nations Members are

(Mr. Zaki, Pakistan)

represented. The question of the cost of relocation, both initial and recurring, also requires careful evaluation. The cost-benefit factor would probably go against such a move. Considering the functional and the financial aspects, the judgement should on balance be in favour of keeping the Office of Disarmament Affairs in New York.

I would like to conclude by expressing the hope that the deliberations of the First Committee at this resumed session will contribute positively to the strengthening of international peace and security.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland): The purpose of this resumed session of the First Committee is to reassess the international disarmament machinery and, we hope, to reach concrete agreed recommendations for appropriate action as a result of that reassessment. I shall therefore confine my remarks to that area.

Finland's views on the broader issues raised by the Secretary-General in his report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" are on record in our 11 November 1992 statement to the First Committee, as well as in my Government's reply to the Secretary-General, reproduced in document A/47/887/Add.2.

Machinery is not, or at least should not be, an end in itself. It should always serve a purpose. It should always produce what is needed at any given time. The times, we all agree, are radically different. So are our expectations for the future. Indeed, to quote a contemporary American sports philosopher, "The future ain't what it used to be".

The international disarmament machinery needs to respond to the new realities of a new era. These new realities are very well identified in the Secretary-General's report.

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

I would like to fasten particularly on the Secretary-General's concept of integration. In his view, the time has come for the practical integration of disarmament and arms-regulation issues into the broader structure of the international peace and security agenda, and that we now need to realize that disarmament constitutes an integral part of international efforts to strengthen international peace and security. We could not agree more.

Now, for the concept of integration to mean anything in practice, it needs to be transferred to the operational level. Practical steps are required to make it happen in terms of the machinery we have.

Such steps can be taken with respect to the General Assembly as a whole, to the First Committee, to the Disarmament Commission, to the Conference on Disarmament and to the Secretariat functions exercised by the Office of Disarmament Affairs. This resumed session of the First Committee can take some practical steps by itself, and it can suggest such steps for others. In our view, the resumed session should do both.

There is now an opportunity to begin developing for the First Committee a role as the political and security committee of the General Assembly, responsible for the consideration of all disarmament and other political and security issues of global import. In that sense, its role should be akin to that of the Second Committee on economic and environmental issues. As such a change would impinge on the mandates of other Committees, a joint review under the President of the General Assembly with a view to such integration would be necessary. In our view, such a review should be conducted during the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly, if not before.

In terms of the First Committee itself, we should now proceed to the full integration of the consideration of disarmament and international-security

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

items. One item currently dealt with in the First Committee, the question of Antarctica, should be transferred to where the true expertise lies - with the concurrence of the Sixth Committee. Of course, from our national point of view, that item does not belong in any committee of the General Assembly. Clustering similar items under generic headings would also be helpful.

The Disarmament Commission has already undergone a reform process. It is important to consolidate the gains, in particular the implementation of the three-item "rolling" agenda.

The role of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating body on global disarmament issues should be reaffirmed. However, for the Conference to continue credibly to negotiate agreements for which universal adherence is then desired its composition cannot remain as it is. We are gratified that the Conference itself has recently come round to the same view. A quick decision is now required.

Let me reiterate our view: at this point in time, all those who either are already members or have applied for membership and who have demonstrated a willingness to contribute to the work of the Conference on Disarmament should be eligible for membership of the Conference, without any sterile balance calculations. Needless to say, Finland considers itself eligible. The composition should then be reviewed at regular intervals, say every five years, to accommodate new entrants and/or to release old workhorses as the case may be.

Finally I wish to touch upon the role of the Office of Disarmament Affairs. My delegation looks forward to hearing the Secretary-General's views on the subject tomorrow. None the less, let me say a few words now. It seems to us obvious, if the logic of the concept of integration is followed through,

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

that any practical steps to ensure integration require strong Secretariat support. Integrating disarmament effectively into the broader structure of the United Nations peace-and-security agenda requires, in our view, that the Office of Disarmament Affairs work hand in glove with those responsible at Headquarters for the other parts of that broader structure, whether preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peace-keeping or peace enforcement.

It is in this light - integrated effectiveness and cost efficiency - that the delegation of Finland will judge any suggestions as to the location of the operations of the Office of Disarmament Affairs.

Mr. CHEN Jian (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The resumed session of the First Committee is being convened today in accordance with General Assembly decision 47/422. That decision called for a reassessment of the multilateral arms control and disarmament machinery, in particular the respective goals of the First Committee, the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the Conference on Disarmament and the Office of Disarmament Affairs and their interrelationship, as well as for concrete and agreed recommendations on ways and means to enhance the functioning and efficiency of said machinery. I should therefore like to share with you the initial views of the Chinese delegation on the subject before us.

The role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament has been discussed and deliberated in the Disarmament Commission for many years, and a consensus report was produced in 1990, which was unanimously adopted at the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly. From then on until now, significant changes have actually occurred in the international situation as well as in that of the disarmament field. The existing disarmament machinery played an important role in bringing about the process of change. When we re-examine the issue today, we must first of all affirm the positive role played by the existing machinery, and put forth concrete and practical reform measures to perfect and improve it in light of the requirements of the new situation and on the basis of thorough deliberation.

We believe that the following principles should be taken into account when we deliberate on measures to reform the existing disarmament machinery of the United Nations

First, the reform must serve to strengthen and increase, but not to weaken or decrease, the role of the existing disarmament machinery;

(Mr. Chen Jian, China)

Secondly, concrete measures shall be decided upon only on the basis of the common deliberations by all the countries concerned; and

Thirdly, the reform measures must further facilitate the extensive participation of the various countries therein. We maintain that, since disarmament bears upon the security of all the countries of the world, they all have the right to participate in the discussion and negotiation on disarmament on an equal footing, irrespective of their geographical location, difference in size and strength, and level of development. In view of the actual circumstances obtaining in the developing countries, the reform measures ought to facilitate the exercise of their right therein.

The First Committee of the General Assembly, a body specialized in dealing with questions of disarmament and international security, constitutes a major forum in which all the United Nations Member States participate in the discussion thereupon. It has been borne out by history that the work of the First Committee has been fruitful. However, its methodologies and procedures should be constantly improved in order to increase its efficiency. Since 1990, the successive sessions of the First Committee have made efforts theretowards and made certain progress. During the current session of the General Assembly, the First Committee combined the discussion of disarmament issues with that on issues of international security, thus saving time and raising efficiency, which marked a successful step as well as a good beginning of reform.

The Disarmament Commission, a special deliberative body within the multilateral disarmament machinery of the United Nations, can conduct in-depth discussions on some priority issues in the field of disarmament, come up with concrete proposals and work out some guidelines so as to move the disarmament

(Mr. Chen Jian, China)

process forward. The Chinese delegation supported and actively participated in the work of the rational adjustment of the agenda items. We therefore are of the opinion that it is desirable for the Disarmament Commission to switch over to the three-item phased approach, as contained in resolution 47/54 A, adopted by the current session of the General Assembly, for it will enable the Commission to concentrate on the deliberation of priority items and improve its efficiency.

The Geneva Conference on Disarmament, the sole global negotiating body for multilateral disarmament, plays an irreplaceable role. We are not going to make further comments on the reform of the Conference, which, we believe, falls within its own purview to decide.

On the involvement of the Security Council in the work of disarmament, the Chinese delegation wishes to point out that the deliberation and negotiation on arms control and disarmament issues should, in the main, be conducted within the existing United Nations disarmament machinery, so as not to divert the strength of the Security Council, which has a burdensome workload.

As an important component of the United Nations Secretariat, the Department of Disarmament Affairs - now the Office of Disarmament Affairs - is an energetic and effective agency, which has done much in providing coordination within and services to the United Nations disarmament machinery. The Chinese delegation wishes to extend its appreciation for the job well done by the Office of Disarmament Affairs and holds that its role should, therefore, be strengthened by guaranteeing adequate personnel and funding commensurate with the requirements of its tasks.

Mr. KHANDOGY (Ukraine): The delegation of Ukraine welcomed the decision of the General Assembly to reconvene meetings of our Committee for the purpose of reassessing the multilateral arms-control and disarmament machinery.

Some might say, however, "Don't fix a car if it ain't broken". But it is also true that any machine requires regular tune-ups and, once in a while, a complete overhaul, especially after a long journey on rough terrain.

The present disarmament machinery was put in place way back in 1978 at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and since then we have made only minor, though important, adjustments. Moreover, the United Nations framework in which disarmament has been pursued was created in the course of the cold war.

My delegation shares the view expressed in the Secretary-General's report "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" that

> "this machinery should be reassessed in order to meet the new realities and priorities of our time". (A/C.1/47/7, para. 43)

In our opinion, it is incumbent upon all Members of the United Nations to design a multilateral disarmament structure that will be able to respond in an efficient manner to the new challenges facing the international community.

It is the view of my delegation that such a structure can be viable if we all recognize the interrelationship between disarmament and international security as its main pillar and harmonize the efforts of the existing multilateral security and disarmament bodies.

We were especially pleased to see this concept receive wide support last fall when the First Committee discussed disarmament and security items in one

(Mr. Khandogy, Ukraine)

single general debate. The delegation of Ukraine is convinced that this practice should be preserved and expanded to include the agenda and the decision-making process. We think it important to look at the agenda of our Committee in the context of the aforementioned report of the Secretary-General, in which he emphasizes that

> "the time has come for the practical integration of disarmament and arms regulation issues into the broader structure of the international peace and security agenda". (ibid., para. 4)

(Mr. Khandogy, Ukraine)

In the bridging of the gap between multilateral disarmament and international security, a key role belongs to the Security Council. In this connection I cannot fail to recall the untiring efforts of many countries, and especially of the late Ambassador Xenon Rossides of Cyprus, in pursuing the idea of greater Security Council involvement in disarmament matters. The delegation of Ukraine closely cooperated with those countries in this field during the forty-second and forty-third sessions of the General Assembly, and indeed made its own contribution in the form of working papers submitted in the Disarmament Commission, and at the third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, regarding revitalization of Article 26 of the Charter of the United Nations.

We are proud to see that those ideas are now getting wide support from the international community and that the Security Council is participating actively, in a variety of ways, in the implementation of various disarmament measures. In this regard, my delegation would like to voice its strong support for the Secretary-General's proposal concerning the enhanced role of the Security Council in the field of disarmament, and in particular the enforcement of non-proliferation.

This issue is of particular importance to Ukraine because my country voluntarily opted for non-nuclear status, and in this context we believe that the Security Council, especially its permanent members, can be instrumental in resolving the question of guarantees of our national security. Of course, there are a number of obligations concerning guarantees towards non-nuclear States to which nuclear Powers have already subscribed. But it is of importance to us that they be confirmed in the context of Ukraine's acquisition of the status of non-nuclear-weapon State.

(Mr. Khandogy, Ukraine)

If the concept that disarmament constitutes an integral part of international efforts to strengthen international peace and security - as referred to in the Secretary-General's report - is to be realized, what will be required, in my delegation's view, is substantial strengthening of the United Nations Secretariat's capacity to deal with the new realities. An administrative decision to bring both the Security Council and the Office of Disarmament Affairs into the Department of Political Affairs was an important step in the right direction. We believe that even further integration of these two important branches is necessary.

In this connection, my delegation is concerned about the intended splitting up of the Department of Disarmament Affairs and the possible transfer of a part of it to Geneva. At a time of a growing tendency towards consolidating disarmament efforts with a view to making them part and parcel of security and even peace-keeping arrangements, such a step could be counterproductive. We are looking forward to hearing an explanation by the Secretary-General concerning the rationale of this decision, and of course we respect his prerogatives in these matters.

At the same time, we want to stress that whatever decision is taken, it should not affect the Secretariat's capacity to service the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission and other disarmament forums here. Moreover, it is important to retain in New York an effective, strong Centre for Disarmament adequately staffed and equipped to carry out important functions at United Nations Headquarters.

I should now like to say a few words about the activity of the Conference on Disarmament, to which my Government affords a great deal of attention.

(Mr. Khandogy, Ukraine)

We fully agree with the conclusion contained in the recent report of the Conference of Disarmament that

> "As the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of the international community, the Conference therefore has an increased role to play". (A/C.1/47/14, para. 9)

Ukraine, a State that inherited from the former USSR an enormous military potential, both conventional and nuclear, has stated on several occasions its desire to participate fully in the negotiation of multilateral disarmament agreements. My delegation wishes to reiterate now our support for an expansion of the Conference on Disarmament that will reflect today's realities and emphasize that disarmament is a collective responsiblity of States. We should like to assure the members of the Conference on Disarmament of our firm commitment to pursue disarmament objectives actively and of our readiness to engage in constructive coooperation in this area with all members of the Conference.

The delegation of Ukraine was pleased to learn of the decision of the Conference on Disarmament to appoint Ambassador O'Sullivan of Australia as Special Coordinator to review the issue of membership, and we are looking forward to working closely with him on this matter.

In conclusion, the delegation of Ukraine would like to express the view that it is absolutely essential to crown our current deliberations by meaningful recommendations adopted by consensus. We are fully aware that consensus is not the only method of adopting decisions in the General Assembly; but in this particular case any decision other than a unanimous one would greatly diminish the chances of its implementeaion - if not ruin them altogether.

Mr. BERDENNIKOV (Russian Federation) (interpretation from Russian): First, I should like to welcome you, Mr. Chairman, the Director of the Office of Disarmament Affairs and the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament. I wish all of you success in carrying out your important work.

The far-reaching changes in the world, characterized by an end to global confrontation, are opening real prospects for progress in strengthening international security. But the current transitional stage has been marked by growing instability, continued armed conflicts and the appearance of a new generation of crises resulting from territorial, ethnic and religious differences.

In these circumstances the work of the United Nations in preventing and eliminating conflicts inevitably involves the inclusion of the question of disarmament in international efforts in the sphere of security and preventive diplomacy. United Nations work along these lines has already begun. Clear proof of this may be found in the report of the Secretary-General entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era". The basic provisions of that document, and in particular the threefold concept of integration, globalization and revitalization, with increased United Nations support for the entire process, are in keeping with the approaches of Russian diplomacy.

I should like to draw representatives' attention to the letter from the Foreign Minister of Russia addressed to the Secretary-General (A/47/902). That letter sets forth our conceptual approaches to this most important area of world politics. I shall not go into all of this in detail, since representatives have the document before them. I wish merely to comment on the following aspects.

(Mr. Berdennikov,
Russian Federation)

It is particularly important to mobilize the efforts of the international community for the effective and consistent implementation of the disarmament agreements that have already been concluded. Another task of the first importance is the coordination of disarmament with steady economic growth in countries that have set forth on the path to disarmament by conversion of their military production capacity. Absolute priority should be given to efforts in the area of non-proliferation of all types of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems. The most important link in this chain is strengthening the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and transforming it into a universal agreement which will remain in effect indefinitely. As the Foreign Minister of Russia emphasized in his letter,

> "We have serious concerns about the fact that accession to the non-proliferation Treaty is sometimes surrounded with additional conditions and is depicted as a special 'concession' to the international community, for which the latter must 'pay a price'." (A/47/902, p.3)

(Mr. Berdennikov,
Russian Federation)

Positive things have happened too, of course, including the decision of Belarus to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a non-nuclear State. We welcome that important and wise decision.

Also of particular importance today is the inclusion of a disarmament element in the process of safeguarding security and finding global and regional solutions to crises. United Nations auspices are most appropriate in a process of reducing the military potential of States and building greater openness and trust. We would suggest also that, using its authority and monitoring capabilities, the United Nations should severely limit the choices open to participants in internal ethnic conflicts with respect to their means of military struggle; such limitation could prevent those conflicts from growing into major international crises. In our view, such restrictions should apply first of all to combat aircraft, to missile and artillery systems and to armoured-force technology. We could thus consider drafting a kind of code of conduct for parties to ethnic conflicts with a view to minimizing destruction and losses among the civilian population and to defusing "hot spots".

It is time for a purposeful review of the functioning of multilateral disarmament machinery. The three bodies established in this area - the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament - remain very important. In the context of streamlining them, we must consider the question of the most effective way of defining their roles and the way in which they would interact under the new conditions.

One positive step already taken is the merging of disarmament and international security issues in the work of the First Committee. It is

(Mr. Berdennikov,
Russian Federation)

important to continue and expand this process, bearing in mind all aspects of international security, including its economic and environmental aspects. In principle, we have no objection to reducing the number of General Assembly committees dealing with these issues. We also consider it important to continue improving the agenda of the First Committee, for example by removing confrontational items that are not in keeping with the times.

The work of the Disarmament Commission also needs to be improved. The Commission, in turn, could then help rationalize the First Committee's work.

We welcome the work, begun at Geneva, to update the Conference on Disarmament. In our view, it is necessary to reaffirm the independent status of the Conference on Disarmament as the body which engages in multilateral negotiation in this sphere and operates on the principle of consensus.

The time has certainly come for deciding the question of the composition of the Conference. It seems possible to consider a significant increase in the number of members of the Geneva forum, perhaps to about one and a half times the present number. In our view, that would help meet the legitimate interest of many States in participating in the Conference's work, an interest which they demonstrated quite some time ago by applying for observer status in the Conference. New States members of the Conference on Disarmament would, of course, have to observe all international agreements in this area.

We think it important in our analysis of the disarmament machinery also to consider improved interaction with the appropriate international organizations such as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the organization to be established for the banning of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Berdennikov,
Russian Federation)

We welcome the Secretary-General's intention to strengthen the Office of Disarmament Affairs, which is the key Secretariat link in the disarmament chain, by providing it with appropriate staffing and funding within the context of existing resources.

Very careful attention must also be given to the question of shifting the centre of gravity of the Office of Disarmament Affairs to Geneva. We cannot help noting that Geneva is the site of the work of the Conference on Disarmament and of conferences on the effectiveness of existing treaties and that the most important national experts in the field are concentrated there. Decisions in this matter must, of course, be taken with due regard for the real Secretariat staffing needs of the competent forums that meet at New York - the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee - and the work and the decisions would also have to be financially justified.

Russia is ready to continue an objective and constructive dialogue with all interested States on ways and means of enhancing the effectiveness of the multilateral disarmament process.

Mr. CARDENAS (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish at the outset to thank the Secretary-General for his report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" (A/C.1/47/7).

This resumed session of the First Committee provides a useful opportunity for us to consider, and briefly state our views on, the multilateral arms-control and disarmament machinery.

My Government believes that in this changing world mankind has an unprecedented window of opportunity; the challenge is to take advantage of that opportunity.

(Mr. Cardenas, Argentina)

Argentina has an action-oriented, positive attitude towards the changes that are taking place. We are ready to cooperate within the limits of our resources in building the new edifice. If they are to be effective, the nature, organs and spheres of competence in the disarmament and international-security areas within the United Nations must stem from the joint will of Member States. In that context, we support a review of that machinery at all levels. We agree with the Secretary-General that it is time for all Member States to participate in an assessment of the Organization's disarmament machinery, so that it can be made to meet the needs of the current international situation.

It is also important, in our view, that the process of conflict settlement should be buttressed by concrete measures of arms control and disarmament. We agree with the Secretary-General's comment that the trend towards transparency in the area of weaponry and other confidence-building measures is important and should be encouraged and that the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms is a practical measure of great importance.

As a contribution in that area, on 16 and 17 March 1993 my country will serve as host to a regional seminar organized jointly by the Office of Disarmament Affairs and the Argentine Foreign Ministry.

(Mr. Cardenas, Argentina)

We agree with the Secretary-General that the Security Council might wish to play a more important role in the area of disarmament, especially in the implementation of non-proliferation measures. The reference to the Security Council in the chemical weapons Convention is an example of how that body can be integrated into multilateral instruments in such a way as to ensure effective compliance. We also believe that we should take advantage of the conclusions to be drawn from the work of the Special Commission created by Security Council resolution 687 (1991).

In connection with the First Committee, ever since the end of the East-West conflict we have noted that there have been greater possibilities for cooperation and constructive dialogue. Proof of this is the increase in the number of resolutions that have been adopted without a vote. We believe that resolutions of this Committee should reflect existing security concerns. In that regard, we welcome the trend towards fewer resolutions: it is far better than the past proliferation of draft resolutions that enunciated abstract concepts of only relative interest or that reflected national rather than common positions.

As regards the First Committee's agenda, we favour an analysis based on the grouping of related, complementary issues. We also support the consolidation of the general debate on the subjects of disarmament and international security, which has streamlined the work of the current session.

The Disarmament Commission, as a deliberative organ with universal membership, allows certain issues to be debated in a pre-negotiation stage. It also allows a conceptual analysis that could contribute to substantive debate in other forums. The process of reform of the Disarmament Commission, embodied in the document adopted in 1990, resulted in the preparation of a

(Mr. Cardenas, Argentina)

programme conducive to the achievement of substantive results. The adoption in 1992 of guidelines and recommendations relating to objective information on military matters is an example of how concrete results can be achieved when all States combine their political will.

As regards the Conference on Disarmament, Argentina reaffirms its role as a multilateral negotiating body on disarmament agreements. Expansion of its membership ought, we believe, to be predicated on an agreement to preserve its efficiency and effectiveness. We support the efforts to widen the membership to include States that could play relevant roles in negotiations, especially in the implementation of future agreements on disarmament and arms control. The successful conclusion of the chemical weapons Convention demonstrates the usefulness of a multilateral body in which all the regions of the world are represented.

Finally, as regards the role of the Office of Disarmament Affairs, we believe that it should have the minimal capacity necessary to carry out the tasks assigned to it by the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. Accordingly, we should bear particularly in mind the additional functions which that Office has assumed, including the management of the registry of conventional weapons created by the resolution 46/36 L.

Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation is delighted to note with satisfaction the manner in which Mr. Elaraby has steered the work of this Committee since the inception of his chairmanship in September 1992, and for the efforts he has deployed in carrying out consultations at different levels and locations up to this time. We are confident that the diplomatic skill with which he has carried us thus far will lead us to the successful outcome of our deliberations during this resumed session. In this connection, my

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

delegation wishes to assure him of its full cooperation. Our appreciation goes also to the other members of the Bureau and the Secretariat for their efforts.

At a time of far-reaching changes in the international situation and in response to a timely request by the Security Council for a more efficient and strengthened United Nations, Nigeria considers the report "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" to be a useful document which invites us all to an evaluation of our Organization's achievement in the area of disarmament and its effect on the maintenance of international security. Nigeria fully endorses the conceptual themes of integration, globalization and revitalization contained in the report, in the belief that they are the right prescriptions for a practical disarmament and arms-control agenda to meet the challenges of the post-cold-war era.

The present international situation presents us with an explosive world, with bloody wars raging in every region and widespread poverty and social deprivation threatening the existence of nations and extinguishing all glimmers of hope for internally sponsored revival. It is becoming more imperative than ever to turn swords into ploughshares and give disarmament the pre-eminence that it deserves by integrating it into all facets of solutions to national, regional and international problems. Naturally, the United Nations is expected to assume an ever-increasing role in seeking, coordinating and promoting prescribed solutions at the multilateral level.

There is a wide recognition that the post-cold-war era presents a great opportunity for multilateralism on which the international community must capitalize. This is therefore the time when multilateral arms control and disarmament stand the greatest chance of success if the political will

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

exists. It is logical that at such a time we should exercise our ambition to achieve the utmost and rid our planet Earth of the threat of nuclear weapons, which since the first special session devoted to disarmament in 1978 has been declared the greatest priority on the United Nations disarmament agenda.

Nuclear weapons still exist in large, frightful quantities and incremental lethality. The situation has become more critical as we now run the risk of horizontal proliferation with the break-up of the former Soviet Union, the subsequent release therefrom of nuclear scientists and the acquisition of nuclear weapons by additional States. The political unrest in and around that area makes us more uncomfortable. The volatility of the international situation compels us to pay serious attention to the effective operation of the regimes on all weapons of mass destruction and on the control and transfer of sophisticated conventional weapons to all areas of tension.

This is certainly a time for expanding, not contracting, arms control and disarmament. Nigeria will therefore support all efforts aimed at strengthening all existing disarmament machinery rather than phasing out any of them. We see the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament as complementary to one another and mutually self-supporting in their functioning. We would like to see the Conference on Disarmament, as the only multilateral negotiating forum, reflect the new geopolitics of the international community in order for it to be more representative.*

---

* The Chairman returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

However, an open-ended membership is not, to us, desirable. Perhaps an additional 12 to 15 members could adequately cover all regions and tendencies of the globe. The agenda for the forum needs also to be more practical and coordinated with that of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Negotiations may be facilitated on an item which has been deliberated upon in the Commission and on which some consensus has been achieved.

The Disarmament Commission is a very important forum that serves as a link between the First Committee, which gives the mandate for the negotiation, and the Conference on Disarmament, which negotiates disarmament and arms-control agreements. The Disarmament Commission is undergoing a process of reform which has rendered it more productive. The recently completed set of guidelines and recommendations by that body on objective information on military matters by that body will no doubt facilitate work on transparency in armament at the Conference on Disarmament. This is the type of positive interrelationship that we must further promote among the three forums. We shall also support any constructive plan to improve the working methods of the First Committee, without hindering substantive participation by delegations of developing and small States in the sessions.

Peace-keeping has become very important, and it should be given all the attention it deserves. However, disarmament efforts should not be made to suffer a diminution of emphasis or interest in the process. As to the suggestion or prospect of a merger of disarmament and peace-keeping issues under the First Committee, my delegation is of the view that this would dilute discussions on either subject area. There is every likelihood that disarmament issues will be pushed to the back burner, while an open-ended,

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

painstaking and extended type of discussion or deliberation, such as currently takes place in the First Committee, will negate the capacity for the quick executive actions needed in peace-keeping. Disarmament and peace-keeping are two important axles around which the work of our Organization revolves. We cannot afford to downgrade either of them in any manner.

The ongoing reforms in the United Nations Office of Disarmament Affairs must be aligned with the needs of the international community in the area of disarmament. The responsibilities devolving on this Office are growing. More than ever the Office needs to promote disarmament at all levels through regional activities. This is in addition to its new responsibilities of maintaining the Register of Conventional Arms Transfers and promoting safe weapon-disposal and conversion of military industrial complexes as disarmament progresses. Adequate funding and personnel must be ensured for this Office, without necessarily increasing the overall budget of the United Nations. It is with this in mind that Nigeria feels that one needs to consider the financial implications of movement or partial movement of the Office to Geneva - besides other concerns, such as effective coverage of disarmament matters by States without representation at the United Nations Office in Geneva.

Nigeria believes that the time has come when the international community must build on past achievements and aim at universality of membership in the various disarmament and arms-control regimes. For this purpose, discriminatory provisions in some of these regimes must be removed. As long as some States remain outside these regimes we cannot be guaranteed non-proliferation of the weapons concerned. In fact, we shall not be able to

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

retain members within these regimes. This opinion is widely shared, as can be deduced from the views submitted by Member States, including Nigeria, on the report of the Secretary-General.

Reading through those views, we note the convergence of opinion in favour of maintaining and strengthening the existing machinery of the United Nations for disarmament and arms control. There was also wide support for the enlargement of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament and for a review of its agenda to reflect current realities. Many delegations considered nuclear-arms control and disarmament to be the priority issue, followed by other weapons of mass destruction. They equally noted the necessity for regional disarmament and confidence-building measures for a more secure world. What that means to us is that the priority objectives in disarmament as agreed in 1978, during the first special session of the Assembly on disarmament, are still valid and that the post-cold-war era presents a unique opportunity for unimpeded operation of the established machinery to achieve those objectives and lay the foundation for a future where disarmament and arms control will become part and parcel of national policies and international relations.

Mr. TELLES RIBEIRO (Brazil): My delegation welcomes this opportunity to address, under your able chairmanship, Sir, the question of enhancing the functioning and efficiency of the multilateral arms-control and disarmament machinery. We look forward to listening to the Secretary-General's statement tomorrow. Its contents are sure to receive thorough and careful consid›ration by all delegations in the course of this week's work.

(Mr. Telles Ribeiro, Brazil)

Without prejudice to a more detailed assessment to be made at a later stage in the light of that statement and the comments made by other delegations, I wish to present my delegation's general view on the roles of the First Committee, the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament and their interrelationship, as well as the role of the Office of Disarmament Affairs.

The Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, adopted by consensus in 1978, stated in a comprehensive and organic way the specific tasks to be undertaken by each of the main bodies concerned with disarmament within the United Nations system. In this regard, the work accomplished by the negotiators of all delegations, from large and small countries, 15 years ago was truly memorable.

Unfortunately, the prevailing realities of that time did not allow the international community to achieve resolute progress towards the lofty goals enshrined in the Final Document, nor proper functioning of the well-balanced machinery foreseen therein. The inability of the second and third Assembly sessions on disarmament to reaffirm and further advance the 1978 consensus was, in this regard, a sad reflection of the standstill reached by the international community in the so-called second cold war era.

Today we are witnessing dramatic and far-reaching transformations of the international scene, in the wake of what has come to be known as the post-cold-war era. The demise of the bipolar dialectic of mutual annihilation has brought with it a renewed search for a multilateral logic of joint preservation. On the posi_ive side, mechanisms that had been paralysed for a long time, such as the Security Council, are springing back to life and

(Mr. Telles Ribeiro, Brazil)

experiencing a process of revitalization, exercising the roles assigned to them by the drafters in 1945. On the negative side, some new, and many old, threats to peace and stability are making even more urgent the search for truly collective security at a universally lower level of armaments.

It is therefore high time that the multilateral machinery of disarmament started effectively fulfilling the tasks assigned by the international community in 1978, just as the Security Council is beginning to function in the way foreseen in 1945. In both cases, the crucial factor is the political will.

(Mr. Telles Ribeiro, Brazil)

The way machinery works depends not only on the adequacy of its features for its purposes, but also on the competence and dedication of its operators.

The First Committee, as the universal body most appropriate for the identification of relevant issues and determination of priorities on the multilateral disarmament agenda, should continue to deal with questions of disarmament and related international-security questions. As a truly universal and democratic body, its resolutions and decisions reflect the sense of the international community regarding those crucial security questions that affect all nations large and small. Recent trends in the debates in the General Assembly point clearly to more pragmatic and result-oriented actions based on ever-increasing consensual perceptions.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission, as the specialized deliberative body within the United Nations disarmament machinery for in-depth deliberations and submission of concrete recommendations on specific disarmament issues, is the universal forum for consensus-building on themes and concepts relevant to the furthering of disarmament efforts. As mentioned in the statement of the Chairman of the Commission this morning, the Commission has been engaged in a reform process over the last few years, and it has already achieved a considerable measure of success. It is of fundamental importance that all delegations continue to give their support to the current process, which this year will be reaching a crucial stage, in order to pave the way for the implementation, from 1994 on, of a three-item phased approach, which will further enhance the Commission as an agile and productive component of the disarmament machinery.

The Conference on Disarmament should continue to perform its role as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of limited size, taking

(Mr. Telles Ribeiro, Brazil)

decisions on the basis of consensus. We support a limited increase in its membership, but the expansion should not affect negatively its operationality. Its continuing contribution to the establishment of binding and effective multilateral treaties was once again underscored by the finalization of the chemical weapons Convention last year. This morning we heard the President of the Conference, who referred to the important work under way in that forum, both on substance and on important procedural and organizational matters. Brazil had the honour to preside over the Conference in the first four weeks of the year, and it was gratifying to see that there is a strong common awareness of the important period the Conference is to go through after the completion of the chemical weapons Convention. Thanks to the existence of a true spirit of compromise and collaboration, the Conference was able to agree on its agenda for 1993 and on the establishment of four ad hoc committees - nuclear-test ban, negative security assurance, outer space and transparency in armaments - plus the continuation of informal consultations on non-proliferation in all its aspects. These decisions, taken at the very outset of its 1993 session, allow the Conference to start its work expeditiously and demonstrate its members' sense of purpose with a view to obtaining results in these crucial areas. My delegation also noted with satisfaction the two reports of the Conference contained in document A/C.1/47/14. It emerges clearly from the document, which expresses the collective view of that body, that the Conference, although recognizing that its work and structure have to be attuned to the new times we are living in, considers that it can best serve the international community by performing its role as the sole negotiating body in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Telles Ribeiro, Brazil)

There is thus a fundamental interrelationship and complementarity among the three bodies, for whose enhancement and dynamization the international community is called upon to demonstrate its full political will.

It is also relevant to say that for a proper functioning of these three bodies, it is fundamental to strengthen the Office of Disarmament Affairs by providing it with adequate staff and resources. In this regard, my delegation will examine very attentively the suggestions to be presented by the Secretary-General for the enhancement of that Office.

A final word on the question of the involvement of the Security Council in disarmament matters, particularly in the enforcement of the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We believe that this matter should be considered very carefully in the light of the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter.

My delegation is ready to participate in an active and constructive way in the discussions in the coming days, with a view to achieving meaningful results at the end of this resumed session of the First Committee.

Mr. YOO (Republic of Korea): On behalf of the delegation of the Republic of Korea, I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for convening this resumed session of the First Committee to consider a number of questions relating to disarmament machinery in the post-cold-war era. Given your distinguished leadership, the resolve of delegations to tackle the problems in a rational and action-oriented manner and the effective support of the Secretariat, my delegation is confident that this session will be successful in strengthening future endeavours in disarmament.

The detailed views of my delegation on the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.1/47/7) entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and

(Mr. Yoo, Republic of Korea)

disarmament in the post-cold-war era" are contained in document A/47/887/Add.1. I should therefore like to take this opportunity to address only a few key points which I believe it is particularly relevant to consider during the session.

To start with, the Republic of Korea sees no reason for fundamental reform of the tripod structure of the First Committee, the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament, or of the functional relationships between these groups.

Assisted by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research and the United Nations study groups, the First Committee functions as an umbrella organization for disarmament issues and serves to identify problem areas while setting the agenda for disarmament.

Meanwhile, the United Nations Disarmament Commission prvides a forum for in-depth deliberation and analysis of more specific issues, while treaty negotiation is conducted in the Conference on Disarmament, the sole body for such activity.

Regarding the existing organizations, my delegation believes that attention should be focused on ensuring more efficient and rational functioning of each of these three forums. It is important to acknowledge that all three bodies face a number of problems in their organization and maintenance, such as the many duplicate items on the agenda of the First Committee and excessive keynote speeches in the Disarmament Commission, to name but two. It is my delegation's hope that these practices will be examined more closely in the future with a view to attaining greater efficiency.

(Mr. Yoo, Republic of Korea)

The next issue I should like to address is the composition of the Conference on Disarmament, on which my delegation places special importance. We have already heard a wide range of views suggesting various formulas for expanding the membership of the Conference. My delegation believes that all nations that wish to join the Conference should have the opportuninty to do so. In fact, we believe the substantial expansion of membership goes hand in hand with the concept of globalization, so eloquently presented in the report of the Secretary-General, and that the contribution by new members could further help existing disarmament efforts.

(Mr. Yoo, Republic of Korea)

If the Conference on Disarmament cannot afford to accept all the nations that wish to join, and if, for reasons of efficiency, the Conference needs to have certain criteria for expansion, we would suggest that the following points be given serious consideration. New membership should be drawn from countries directly involved in major international tension, whose disarmament would help to reduce that tension; countries that have the desire and ability to contribute to disarmament; and countries with considerable military capability and military industries.

Membership should also appropriately reflect geographical distribution.

Whether the Conference on Disarmament should be expanded or not is a moot question, I believe. Rather, today's concerns are focused on how such expansion is to be brought about. As the Conference is a product of the cold war, its membership clearly must be modified to reflect present changes in the world. In this regard, my delegation is hopeful that long-overdue issues will be finalized during the current session of the Conference on Disarmament.

I should also like to mention that, over the past few years, the United Nations has made notable progress in the field of disarmament, such as the implementation of the Register of Conventional Arms. This has inevitably imposed ever-increasing demands on the Office of Disarmament Affairs.

Consequently, we feel that there is a need to seriously consider how we can best strengthen the Office of Disarmament Affairs, and my delegation fully supports a proposal to allocate more resources to the Office. However, we believe that to do so effectively some basic data should be made available, including the number and responsibilities of current Office of Disarmament Affairs staff. My delegation joins others in requesting that the

(Mr. Yoo, Republic of Korea)

Secretary-General provide current information on the Office to Member States and, if possible, his own proposal for the employment of additional personnel.

Another issue has come up recently regarding the transfer of the Office to Geneva, on which I should like to offer a brief comment. While I am not familiar with the background of the proposal, my delegation sees no particular advantage to transferring the Office of Disarmament Affairs to Geneva as long as the First Committee meets in New York. As we are all aware, the First Committee is the umbrella organization of disarmament, charged with the oversight of all matters related to it. Particularly in the light of the Security Council's growing role in disarmament, the argument in favour of transferring the Office is not persuasive enough.

My delegation has full confidence that this resumed session will produce useful and concrete results in these endeavours, and we are prepared to offer our full cooperation towards this end.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Deputy Permanent Observer of Switzerland.

Mr. CHAPPUIS (Switzerland) (interpretation from French): My delegation attaches great importance to this special session of the First Committee. We are pleased at how efficiently the Chairman is guiding its work and we appreciate the opportunity to speak before the Committee.

Arms regulation and disarmament can be regarded as one of the most successful achievements of the post-cold-war era. Many bilateral, regional and international agreements have been concluded, and measures have been taken that certainly are helping to strengthen international security. I shall mention only the latest achievement, namely, the agreement on the elimination of chemical weapons, which was signed by more than 130 States in January in Paris.

(Mr. Chappuis, Switzerland)

We can thus welcome the achievements of the last few years. But much remains to be done, and we also must make sure that these agreements and measures are effectively implemented.

Despite the international instruments available, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is still a major problem, to which the international community must continue giving priority consideration. The year 1995 will be an important one for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Also, we must pay even more attention to conventional weapons. These are just some of the issues that have to be taken up within the context of appropriate machinery.

Hence my delegation would like to thank the Secretary-General for his report "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" (A/C.1/47/7). This is a very timely report, and it identifies clearly important issues and gives a new impetus to efforts by the international community to find satisfactory solutions within the context of appropriate machinery.

Switzerland has been following with great interest all of the international efforts dealing with measures on confidence-building, arms regulation and disarmament. We participate wherever we can, for instance in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), in the work undertaken, and we also participate in applying agreed measures. So far, Switzerland has ratified all comprehensive agreements negotiated within the context of the Conference on Disarmament and preceding institutions.

In addition, we are considering ratifying as soon as possible, subject to parliamentary approval, the most recent Convention - that on chemical weapons - which we signed in Paris. We also intend to make a contribution to

(Mr. Chappuis, Switzerland)

the establishment of the new Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons at the Hague, and we intend to offer, in so far as possible, the services of our nuclear and chemical laboratory at Spiez and of a sophisticated chemical industry. Switzerland participates actively in all international efforts to combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and we shall also be involved in the exchange of information in order to draw up the Register of Conventional Weapons.

Referring to the excellent report of the Secretary-General, I should like to raise one last point which my Government regards as particularly important: to carry out our work to the satisfaction of as many Member States as possible, we need the right kind of machinery. However, the Conference on Disarmament, because of its composition, is perhaps no longer so well suited to present realities. We feel that its membership should be open to all States that wish to join it and that have actively expressed their interest and their commitment.

The Conference on Disarmament, the sole body negotiating comprehensive agreements, is a very valuable institution and, in the interests of all, it should be able to continue its work under the best possible conditions. We believe that its limited membership somehow weakens its global vocation, and so, in the opinion of my authorities, its membership should be as broad as possible. Arguments against this have now, we feel, become irrelevant. This Conference has only 40 members, but it has never worked any faster than other, larger organizations. For example, after the conclusion of the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, 15 years were needed before any new achievement could be noted.

(Mr. Chappuis, Switzerland)

Lastly, we must point out that it is the political will to succeed, whatever the size of the body that is seeking agreement, that is really crucial. We are also a little skeptical about the argument of regional balances: the principle of consensus that prevails in the Conference on Disarmament shortens its potential reach, not to mention the current state of flux and the question of redefining regions and the growing importance of functional groupings.

In conclusion, I wish to assure the Committee that my Government will continue actively and constructively to participate in international efforts to strengthen international security. Nevertheless, we hope that our request for full participation in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva - and we made that request some years ago - will be taken into account as soon as the next session of the Conference opens. Switzerland's commitment shows its resolve to meet its obligations and discharge its responsibilities as a full member. Lastly, the already close relations between the host State and the Conference on Disarmament would thereby be further strengthened.

Mr. SOEGARDA (Indonesia): Let me first associate myself with those of my colleagues who have spoken before me, Sir, and express my pleasure at seeing you once again in the Chair, guiding our deliberations with characteristic dispatch and dedication.

The decision to convene this resumed session of the First Committee reflects the profound sense of urgency with which we all view the overriding need to terminate the arms race, with its incalculable consequences for mankind as a whole.*

In that regard, the views of my delegation on the report of the Secretary-General entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" have already been expressed, both in our statement of last November and in our response to the Secretary-General's note verbale, contained in document A/47/887/Add.2. While Indonesia concurred with the report's general framework of promoting arms reductions, we expressed at the same time reservations on certain aspects, for the report seeks new and as yet uncharted directions. We believe that the approaches set out in the report call for serious appraisal and assessment, particularly in the context of post-cold-war realities.

We welcome the broadening and deepening of the dimensions of disarmament. Beyond the mere regulation of armaments and the arms race, agreements now provide for the destruction of existing arsenals and the limitation of future production. Thus, we are encouraged by the progress made in limiting nuclear and conventional armaments, which would have been unthinkable even a few years ago.

---

* Mr. Patokallio (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Soegarda, Indonesia)

But the disarmament asgenda is still unfinished, and much more needs to be done. Formidable roadblocks continue to exist to a nuclear-free world and to nuclear peace, as large strategic forces are still maintained. Accelerated efforts on other priority issues, particularly the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, are also needed. Further aggravating the situation is the proliferation of sophisticated armaments, the qualitative improvement of weapons through testing, the accelerated momentum of arms sales and the relentless accumulation of the conventional armaments that are the main instruments of local wars and armed conflicts. Meanwhile, world military expenditures continue to be disproportionate to the unmet urgent needs of development assistance. Hence, we should seek new and more substantive disarmament measures by focusing attention on the issues that have already been identified by the international community as being of priority concern.

One of the purposes of this resumed session is to review the role of multilateral disarmament bodies and their interrelationship. My delegation has carefully addressed this question, including the roles of the General Assembly and the Security Council. In this endeavour, a review of the relevant General Assembly resolutions and the status of negotiations in bilateral and multilateral forums, as well as the reports of the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament, will provide valuable input.

If conducted in a constructive manner, such an assessment will undoubtedly prove useful and instructive, as valuable conclusions can be drawn from the achievements as well as from the shortcomings. It would seem to us much more productive, therefore, to recognize and stress the positive aspects and new insights on the disarmament process gained so far and to acknowledge

(Mr. Soegarda, Indonesia)

the negative aspects and the drawbacks we have faced and inject a fresh resolve to remedy these, and thereby to give new impetus to our continuing efforts.

That is my delegation's understanding of what we mean when we speak of adopting a forward-looking, concrete and result-oriented approach towards disarmament.

In our firm view, then, the machinery needed for addressing major disarmament issues already exists and has proven its effectiveness; attempts to change or modify the roles or mandates of the constituent parts of that machinery are unlikely to contribute at this juncture to further the cause of arms limitation and reduction.

As far as the First Committee is concerned, my delegation has long endorsed the proposal to rearrange its agenda in order to facilitate a more rational and focused discussion. Such endeavours, however, should not prejudge the substance of issues or infringe upon the right of Member States to bring any relevant issue before the Committee. In that context, my delegation hopes that members will consider favourably the establishment of an ad hoc working group composed of previous Chairmen and Bureau members of the Committee to identify further rationalization measures.

The Conference on Disarmament, however, has an uneven record of accomplishments. With the exception of the Convention on chemical weapons, which was concluded after protracted negotiations, the Conference has fallen far short of expectations in fulfilling its mandate on nuclear and related issues. The establishment of an ad hoc working group on a nuclear-test ban augurs well for the substantive consideration of that long-pending issue; we hope this will lead to the consideration of questions related to nuclear

(Mr. Soegarda, Indonesia)

disarmament. Hence, rather than assuming a supervisory role over some existing disarmament treaties, as called for in the report, the Conference on Disarmament should shoulder its responsibility as the multilateral body for disarmament negotiations on generally agreed proposals, with a view to their speedy implementation.

In the same context, my delegation envisages a vastly enhanced role for the Office of Disarmament Affairs. Indonesia attaches particular importance to providing it with increased personnel and resources and to bringing it under the direction and responsibility of a higher official to enable it to cope with the ever-increasing demands on its expertise. We also believe that the Office should continue to be located at Headquarters, so it can conduct its activities in accordance with General Assembly resolutions.

The report rightly emphasizes the importance of regional approaches to disarmament and security. In an intraregional context, where geographic location has placed nations in permanent proximity to one another, the triad of disarmament, security and development is interwoven and inseparable. In many regions there is a long tradition of cooperation and the existence of permanent institutions and modalities; this has reduced sources of conflict and strengthened regional security. In addition to the adoption of certain arms-limitation measures, various instruments for cooperation have been established in areas such as the economic, social and cultural fields. These can be viewed as measures that contribute to the building of confidence and hence of international security. Through its effect on regional security, regional cooperation will induce mutual restraint in armament programmes, thus preventing or moderating arms races which are regionally sourced.

(Mr. Soegarda, Indonesia)

It is clear, however, that regional efforts can only supplement, not supplant, the United Nations in meeting its global responsibilities. Consequently, what is called for is a thorough exploration of possible mechanisms and procedures that would strengthen interaction between the United Nations and various regional organizations in the area of promoting arms limitation and enhancing security arrangements. In this, no single approach can be adequate, as each region displays its own characteristics and level of cohesion.

In conclusion, it is my delegation's hope that the resumed session of the First Committee will be able to pronounce itself unambiguously on the need to enhance and strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and also to recommend measures to the General Assembly on increasing the effectiveness of the existing disarmament machinery.

Mr. NEAGU (Romania): At the outset, may I express my appreciation for the efforts the Chairman has made not only in convening this resumed session of the First Committee of the General Assembly but also in promoting new ideas and concrete measures during his active consultations, both here and in Geneva, regarding the Secretary-General's report on "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era", which sketches important guidelines for the promotion of disarmament.

The Secretary-General rightly stresses that the time has come for integrating in a practical way the issues of disarmament and arms regulation with the larger structure of the agenda for ensuring and strengthening international peace and security. In the light of these new requirements, it is also necessary to update the agenda and machinery of multilateral negotiations on disarmament.

My delegation fully supports and highly commends the report of the Conference on Disarmament on the subject, and it greatly appreciates the opportunity to ponder important issues of the present international reality. Especially valuable are the elements, highlighted by the report, that expand and enrich the concept of disarmament and arms regulation as a key element in the pursuit of overall international security in the present circumstances.

As regards the concept of integration, my delegation is in agreement with the basic premise that the process of comprehensive disarmament should be closely coordinated with efforts in other fields and should be part of the larger network of such international cooperative behaviour as peacemaking, peace-keeping and peace building. As to globalization, we support the reaffirmation in the report of the goal to extend disarmament efforts to include both bilateral and multilateral agreements in a world-wide process involving all States. As for the concept of revitalization, we agree that the

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

substantial achievements in nuclear disarmament should serve as encouragement for further endeavours.

Non-proliferation, especially of weapons of mass destruction, is a major concern of the international community. There are real proliferation risks which call for rigorous implementation of the existing international instruments. With the chemical weapons Convention in place, the legal basis for preventing the spread of all weapons of mass destruction is almost complete. Greater attention, however, should be given to supplier controls as a necessary element of non-proliferation efforts. Romania adheres to and supports the aim and activities of the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Australia Group and the Nuclear Suppliers' Guidelines.

The non-proliferation Treaty, which is approaching universality, is a solid basis for curbing nuclear proliferation. Romania supports the extension of the Treaty indefinitely and unconditionally at the 1995 Review Conference. Meanwhile, we deem it necessary that the implementation mechanism be enhanced and full-scope safeguards be required for nuclear exports. At the same time, the effective implementation of the on-site inspection capability of the International Atomic Energy Agency is essential.

Recent developments have certainly raised new expectations for the achievement of a nuclear-test-ban treaty, which is one of the four priority areas of discussions at the Conference on Disarmament, the most appropriate body for dealing with this global issue.

There are also good opportunities for achieving progress on such important issues as the prevention of an arms race in outer space and effective international arrangements to ensure that non-nuclear-weapon States are protected against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We hope

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

that the discussions at the Conference on Disarmament on these subjects will have the expected results.

Transparency in armaments is continuously gaining in importance, since the acquisition and destabilizing accumulation of conventional weapons in areas of regional conflicts is a real threat to international peace and security. The benefits of increased transparency and openness are obvious. Though confidence-building measures cannot replace reductions in the number of weapons, they still have a most positive impact by preventing undue suspicion and misunderstandings, thus paving the way for disarmament measures.

As part of universal measures promoting transparency and openness, the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms opens up new prospects which all States should try to utilize. Romania will give its data by the established date. But the Register will really be effective only if all United Nations Member States provide the required information.

With respect to the question of disarmament machinery, my delegation is in full agreement with the Secretary-General on the need to strengthen coordination within the current basic institutional triad composed of the First Committee of the General Assembly, the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament. These bodies have distinct and complementary mandates as well as different compositions and working methods.

The report of the Conference on Disarmament on the ongoing review of its agenda, composition and methods of work reveals the preoccupation of both member and observer States on increasing the efficiency of this sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of the international community. We are convinced that there is room to improve its methods of work and we support the ongoing consultations on the review of the issue of its agenda. As to the

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

membership, my Government is ready to consider a substantial increase of the number of member States in order to accommodate as many candidates as possible that wish to contribute to its substantive work. However, we have to bear in mind the need to preserve the efficiency of the Conference on Disarmament as a negotiating body.

The role, overall issues, agenda and organization of the future activity of the Disarmament Commission have already been the subject of an examination and of some important reconsiderations. While still in a transitional stage on the way to a reorganization and real increase of its efficiency, the Disarmament Commission will have much to gain from the implementation of the resolution on its future work adopted at the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly. It is of the utmost importance that, at future sessions of the Disarmament Commission, first priority should be assigned to ensuring the conditions for basic negotiations and debates and for drafting significant documents, thus furthering recommendations on matters of great interest in the field of arms control and disarmament.

Increasing the efficiency of the First Committee of the General Assembly will depend greatly on the extent to which its agenda and the organization of its work reflect the generally acknowledged reality that, under the present circumstances, arms-control and disarmament issues must be examined while bearing in mind their interrelationship to international and regional security and stability. It is therefore necessary to promote activity aimed at improving its work and reshaping its agenda by concentrating on truly priority matters, having especially in view practical, future-oriented results.

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

Certain steps in this direction were taken at the last session of the General Assembly. Thus, the number of resolutions considerably decreased and the percentage of those adopted by consensus increased, together with the focus on specific items and with concrete approaches and results.

The organization at the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly, for the first time, of a single general debate on both disarmament and international security had two obvious advantages: first, the possibility of a thorough examination of the issues of disarmament and security, with their natural interconnection; and, secondly, à large saving in time and resources, with the possibility of redirecting them towards consultations and negotiations on specific issues. This method of work ought to become a permanent practice of the First Committee at future sessions.

With respect to the United Nations Secretariat services for the debates and negotiations in New York and Geneva, we believe that the allocation of posts and the structure of duties should be considered in relation to the evaluation of the responsibilities of various intergovernmental forums at the two locations. In any case, the present composition of the staff in Geneva has to be strengthened in order to cope with the increased requirements. Also, we could think about the possibility of institutionally linking the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research with the activities of the Conference on Disarmament.

We should also like the Office of Disarmament Affairs in New York to receive the necessary resources to carry out its increased tasks appropriately.

Ms. MASON (Canada): In Canada's written submission in response to the "New Dimensions" report by the Secretary-General, we suggested that this resumed session offered us the opportunity to reaffirm the distinct role of

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

each of the three multilateral disarmament bodies and of the Office of Disarmament Affairs as the institutional focal point for multilateral disarmament activity, provide additional impetus to the ongoing work of rationalization of the three bodies, and provide an opportunity for focused consideration of practical ways to enhance the effective interaction of these three bodies.

Harking back to the Secretary-General's theme of integration and to his view, which Canada, like Finland, fully shares, that the time has come for practical measures to be taken better to integrate disarmament and arms-regulation issues into the broader structure of the international peace and security agenda, we ended our written submission with the following statement:

> "... [there is] the need to 'liberate' the term 'arms control and disarmament' from its cold-war preoccupation with numbers of weapons. As important as this is, arms control is now seen to both embrace and constitute part of a far broader process of confidence building, of transparency, of accountability, of verification and, most importantly, of promoting less reliance on weapons and more reliance on genuinely cooperative mechanisms for creating and enhancing international peace and security". (A/47/887, p. 21 (para. 29))

Since that submission was forwarded, proposals have circulated informally regarding the Office of Disarmament Affairs which, rather than promoting better integration, appear to reflect an over-compartmentalized view of disarmament which fails to take due account of the increasingly close and mutually supportive relationship between disarmament and other United Nations activities in the security-building domain.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

On the one hand, there is the work of the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission which is aimed at developimg and promoting broad norms and principles, such as non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the need for verification of arms-control agreements. It falls then to the Conference on Disarmament to enshrine these principles as much as possible in binding multilateral agreements. On the other hand, the deliberative bodies are focused on the most basic tools for minimizing, managing and resolving disputes peacefully, beginning with confidence-building measures, and openness in military matters. The latter activity of the deliberative disarmament machinery of the United Nations reached a new action-oriented phase with the establishment of the United Nations Register on Conventional Arms.

Such actions at the global level provide an important framework and impetus for the development of regional mechanisms and processes for enhancing security. The Office of Disarmament Affairs, as the institutional focal point of this security-building work at the global level, can help ensure complementarity and mutually reinforcing interaction between the global and the regional levels. In addition, activities of the Office of Disarmament Affairs in promoting and facilitating regional-security dialogue are particularly important where existing regional organizations may be poorly equipped to do this or where institutional mechanisms for such dialogue may be lacking altogether.

Simply put, the United Nations cannot hope, over the long term, to reduce the time it devotes to crisis management if it does not expend some considerable effort on nurturing workable mechanisms for the peaceful resolution of disputes long before they reach the crisis stage. This is conflict prevention in its most fundamental sense. The regional activities of

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

the Office of Disarmament Affairs should also be seen as an integral part of the early-warning apparatus of the United Nations. Likewise, the arms-control database, including the arms register, should be seen as part of the arsenal of information, techniques and expertise that the United Nations can call upon in its early-warning, good-offices and other preventive-diplomacy efforts.

In our view, then, the work of the Office of Disarmament Affairs - and indeed of the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission - should be more closely integrated into the other preventive-diplomacy efforts of the United Nations.

This analysis not only suggests that the location of the Office of Disarmament Affairs must continue to be New York but also raises questions as to the scope of the work of the First Committee. In particular, it raises the issue whether we should consider integrating consideration of disarmament and other political/security issues at the Main Committee level. On this point, I listened with interest to the comments of Ambassador Marin-Bosch in his opening statement where he reminded us of the agreement reached at the first special General Assembly session on disarmament to focus the work of the First Committee only on questions of disarmament and related interntational security questions. Our point is that the issue of what is a related international security question has now broadened considerably, and the work of the First Committee should therefore seek to take account of this.

I should like to turn now to some concrete proposals for consideration by the resumed session.

To further the process of integration, Canada, like Finland, expresses support for a review to be undertaken during the forty-eighth session of the

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

General Assembly on the possible integration of consideration of disarmament and other political/security issues at the Main Committee level.

To further the process of rationalization and effective functioning of the work of the First Committee, we would suggest the following measures - and we note that a number of them have been put forward by other delegations as well: integration of consideration on disarmament and international security items; allocation of the item "Question of Antarctica" for consideration in the Sixth Committee; regarding plenary statements, introuction of notional time limits, distribution of written texts and oral delivery of executive summaries only; further rationalization of the programme of work to organize similar items better and to promote more informal dialogue and debate during consideration of similar items.

Regarding the Disarmament Commission, we urge adoption in principle of a three-item rolling agenda; encourage advance circulation of joint working papers bridging differing views; and suggest that in order better to coordinate the work of the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission, the Commission refer worthy ideas directly to the Conference.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

We fully support the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating body on arms regulation and disarmament. We welcome the progress it is making in reassessing its role, and we also note the establishment of Special Coordinators, whose work will soon be concluded. Canada encourages the Conference to act quickly and decisively on the question of membership. Canada does not support any new supervisory role for the Conference.

Regarding the Office of Disarmament Affairs, we should like to see the resumed session affirm the central role of a strengthened and revitalized Office in multilateral disarmament activity, as an integral part of the process of strengthening international peace and security. To that end, we would stress the following tasks: the establishment of a computerized database on arms control and non-proliferation, including as an integral part the United Nations arms register; the promotion of regional approaches to disarmament, non-proliferation and conflict-prevention; and the development of additional concrete measures to promote disarmament, arms regulation and non-proliferation at the global, regional and national levels.

Given the importance of the issue of revitalizing the United Nations disarmament machinery and the short time we have before us now, we would suggest that it be included in the provisional agenda of the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly, under an item entitled "Integration of disarmament and arms regulation issues into the international peace and security agenda of the United Nations".

Mr. PAK (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to join the others in high appreciation of the Chairman's endeavours in convening the current meetings to resume the discussion of one of the most important issues facing the world today.

Although tremendous changes have taken place in the international situation in recent years, the issue of disarmament still remains a priority to be solved. It is a common concern of humankind to realize disarmament and dismantle all weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear ones, in line with the situation after the end of the cold war. Under these circumstances, my delegation regards the report (A/C.1/47/7) entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era", submitted by the Secretary-General last October, as part of the efforts of the United Nations to promote a process of disarmament and provide for peace and security.

The report was really presented at an appropriate time. First, it raises the hope that the changed international environment will create favourable circumstances for disarmament and that a series of disarmament measures worthy of welcome can promote a process of disarmament. Secondly, despite the change in international circumstances, some nuclear-weapon States are speeding up the modernization of nuclear weapons, continuing to export weapons and ignoring the development of nuclear weapons by some countries.

My delegation supports the view that measures should be taken to promote the disarmament process to meet the changed environment and that priority be given to the removal of weapons of mass destruction in the realization of disarmament.

My Government has put forward a proposal for the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and has made consistent efforts for its realization. As part

(Mr. Pak, Democratic People's Republic of Korea)

of its efforts, it acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in order to remove the nuclear threat directed towards my country for 35 years.

Last year, a Safeguards Agreement was concluded with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and accordingly 6 rounds of IAEA inspections were made of our nuclear facilities, through which it was confirmed that the nuclear activities in my country are for peaceful purposes.

In spite of this fact, the United States put forward a scenario called "two suspect sites" and called upon us to accept IAEA inspection on the sites instead of opening up its own nuclear bases and nuclear weapons deployed in south Korea. In addition, a resolution calling for acceptance of what they called "two suspect sites" was adopted at the recent meeting of the Board of Governors of IAEA. It is nothing but a product of premeditated manoeuvres by the United States to use the organization to exert unreasonable pressure upon us.

As is well known, the representative of the United States put forward a "challenge inspection" on military bases at the meeting last October. As they could not justify imposing inspections of military bases by means of pressure through the North-South Joint Nuclear Control Committee, they made IAEA pass a resolution forcing inspection of the "suspect sites". They are now threatening to bring this issue before the Security Council.

On the other hand, the United States has blocked the various channels of north-south dialogue by resuming the "Team Spirit" joint military exercises, leading to a tenser situation on the Korean peninsula, rather than taking helpful steps for the normal operation of the North-South Nuclear Control Committee and the North-South Joint Military Committee.

(Mr. Pak, Democratic People's Republic of Korea)

At the same time, the United States has not said even a word about their opening up of their bases and nuclear weapons deployed in south Korea and their consequent inspections. It is also a recognized fact that Japan and south Korea are developing their own nuclear weapons with the tacit approval of the United States.

All the facts show clearly that it is the United States that creates artificial obstacles to our implementation of the Safeguards Agreement, which is proceeding smoothly, and fails to implement its own obligations under the NPT.

The post-cold-war era urgently demands that the arbitrariness of a few States be prevented and a new, just international order established. In order to preserve international peace and security, the disarmament process should be accelerated with particular attention to the following points.

First, guaranteeing fairness in international relations in order to contribute to the process of disarmament in the changed circumstances is a prerequisite. No sort of privileges or arbitrariness should be tolerated, and mutual respect, non-interference, equality and mutual benefits should be thoroughly observed.

Secondly, dialogues and negotiations should be encouraged and mutual confidence created. All acts that exacerbate tensions should be avoided, and the principle of solving issues in dispute through dialogue and negotiations should be respected.

Thirdly, priority should be accorded to nuclear disarmament. My delegation believes that, for the realization of nuclear disarmament aimed at the removal of nuclear weapons from our planet, the following measures should

(Mr. Pak, Democratic People's Republic of Korea)

be taken: the treaty on the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear tests should be concluded; pending the adoption of the treaty, the nuclear-weapon States should take steps to halt their nuclear tests; and the nuclear-weapon States should legally assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and take measures to withdraw any kind of nuclear weapons deployed outside of their own terrirories and destroy them.

Fourthly, the existing disarmament treaties should be reviewed and the unequal ones amended.

Fifthly, it is necessary to revitalize the activities of the Conference on Disarmament and, in particular, the United Nations Disarmament Commission, to draw up guidelines for disarmament.

My delegation hopes that the resumed session will make a positive contribution towards promoting the disarmament process in the changed international situation.

Mr. O'BRIEN (New Zealand): The Secretary-General's report, presented last October, set in train a welcome process aimed at enhancing the functioning, efficiency and relevance of the machinery for multilateral disarmament and arms control in the post-cold-war era.

New Zealand therefore considers that the convening of this resumed session of the First Committee is timely. It provides, we think, an opportunity for all Member States to reassess how the various components of the disarmament machinery can best be adapted to the challenges of a changing world. We are encouraged by the constructive and active approach to this task taken by many Members, as reflected in the thoughtful written responses compiled for this session. We have also listened carefully to the views expressed today, and we are struck by the commonality of approach to reform issues that can be discerned across a broad spectrum.

New Zealand's own particular views are reflected in more detail in document A/47/887/Add.1; these include our suggestions for improving the functioning of the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament.

One of the main conclusions we draw from the Secretary-General's report and its three themes - integration, globalization and revitalization - is that now more than ever security and arms control are matters that should involve all States. To be effective, the nature of the process must be inclusive, and all States have a responsibility to contribute. This principle of universality provides a yardstick against which we can measure the existing United Nations disarmament machinery during this resumed session.

(Mr. O'Brien, New Zealand)

Clearly, if one of our goals is to promote universal adherence to and implementation of negotiated disarmament agreements, full participation in those negotiations by all interested States is indispensable.

New Zealand recognizes that the enlargement of the Conference on Disarmament is a complex issue, but we agree with several others who spoke earlier today that the time has come for a decision. We believe that this resumed session can contribute to that decision. For our part, New Zealand favours open-ended membership, because it would ensure that all countries with a demonstrated interest in and commitment to disarmament and arms control are able to participate on an equal footing, as full members. Such a composition would, in our view, best serve the interests of the international community in the field of disarmament and would lend greater legitimacy to the negotiated results.

New Zealand's commitment to disarmament and arms control is of long standing. As an observer to the Conference on Disarmament, New Zealand has over the years sought to participate actively in its work and that of its ad hoc committees, including at the scientific and technical level. In order to be able to contribute fully to the process of negotiation, however, we have for several years sought full membership of the Conference. We are ready to assume the responsibilities that this entails.

Bearing in mind the concrete results we all seek, it is important that the commitment of Member States to improved functioning and efficiency be matched by the United Nations itself. Accordingly, a strong international secretariat supporting the activities of the various multilateral forums can

(Mr. O'Brien, New Zealand)

play a central role in underpinning prospects for real progress. New Zealand consequently recognizes the need to ensure that the Office of Disarmament Affairs is appopriately staffed, resourced and positioned to carry out its key tasks and functions, including the operation of the conventional-arms Register and the coordination of the activities of the regional Centres.

In the course of this week, working with others who share the goal of a strengthened United Nations in the field of disarmament, New Zealand looks forward to making concrete progress on these interrelated issues.

Mr. KUKAN (Slovakia): My delegation would like to express its satisfaction with the way in which this resumed session of the First Committee was prepared. The documents for these meetings contain valuable contributions from a number of delegations which push forward the work in this very important field of United Nations activities.

The report of the Secretary-General, "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era", contains many inspiring ideas that could further enhance the movement towards a safer world. To achieve that goal, we should take appropriate advantage of the new favourable situation of international affairs that followed the end of the bipolar division of the world. My delegation agrees with the assessment in the Secretary-General's report that today's world has become a little safer but considerably more complicated. We are witness to the validity of that evaluation, and everything attests to the fact that it will remain valid for years to come.

The delegation of Slovakia holds that three concepts outlined by the Secretary-General for future activities in the field of disarmament constitute

(Mr. Kukan, Slovakia)

the cornerstone of the efforts of the United Nations and its relevant disarmament bodies: integration, globalization and revitalization. I want to single out the part of the Secretary-General's report entitled "Conclusion. New Challenges". The new set of problems - the post-disarmament issues mentioned in the report - constitute one of the most burning issues Slovakia is facing now. The present period of transition to a market economy in my country is complicated by the task of the gradual transformation of the military-oriented industrial complex into enterprises serving social, humanitarian and development needs. Needless to say, the economic reality in Slovakia makes this task more difficult; that economic reality, to a great extent, dictates the pace of the process of conversion.

I wish to express appreciation for document A/C.1/47/14, containing the text of a letter from the President of the Conference on Disarmament addressed to the Chairman of the First Committee. The current situation in the Conference on Disarmament can be characterized as a time of seeking goals for both the short and the long term.

We believe that a larger number of countries should participate not only in the general debate of the Conference on Disarmament but also in the negotiations and the active decision-making process within the Conference with respect to issues such as security- and confidence-building measures. Passive participation - for example, defining the military doctrines of individual States and so forth - is not sufficient. It is necessary to secure active participation by all involved States - including key States by all means - in the formulation of international treaties, including international monitoring of compliance.

(Mr. Kukan, Slovakia)

We consider it important that effective Secretariat support to the Conference on Disarmament be maintained, for it is the single negotiating body for arms control and disarmament. We highly commend the work and the activities of the Office of Disarmament Affairs; we think its role in the reform process within the United Nations should be further strengthened, in terms both of staff and of resources.

I would like to comment on the issue of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament. As described in the letter from the President of the Conference on Disarmament, there is a broad range of opinion on this issue. The vast majority of members and non-members, however, agree that the composition of the Conference should reflect the new face of the world situation. Practically all States have expressed the wish that this issue be resolved as expeditiously as possible. My delegation's view accords with that generally accepted position.

(Mr. Kukan, Slovakia)

We support the substantial, yet not unlimited, expansion of membership of the Conference on Disarmament. At the same time, while achieving this goal we must maintain the Conference's efficiency in negotiating.

While speaking about this issue I cannot help mentioning the issue of Slovakia's membership in the Conference on Disarmament, which has already been discussed in different forums. Let me take this opportunity, in speaking to the First Committee, to say that we fail to understand why this issue has not yet been resolved. The question of membership, the composition of the Conference on Disarmament, is complex. As became clear, lengthy, intensive negotiations are required to establish the new format of the Conference on Disarmament, acceptable to every State. Even with the most positive goodwill of the participants, it will take months before a solution is reached.

In this situation, the delegation of Slovakia cannot see why the issue of membership of the former Conference on Disarmament member, the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, is not resolved now. We do not understand, and oppose, the argument that it must be tied to the broader issue of Conference on Disarmament membership. We think that the issue of Slovakia's membership should be dealt with separately, without any delay. That is in accordance with the established practice. The Conference on Disarmament has had experience in dealing with similar issues in the past as life or world developments brought them about. I am sure that will be the case in the future as well. We really do not see why the current case of Slovakia should be an exception.

Slovakia's application for membership in the Conference on Disarmament in succession to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic follows the political

(Mr. Kukan, Slovakia)

agreement of the two successor States of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic. I mention this fully aware of the fact that this agreement is simply of an informative nature; it has no other implications. However, it should be seen as important information. We perceive Slovakia's taking the place formerly occupied by Czechoslovakia as an adequate reflection of the existing situation in the Conference on Disarmament; we perceive it as a result of the civilized split of Czechoslovakia and in the light of the stabilizing effect of the fast establishment of the Slovak and Czech Republics within the system of international organizations.

Naturally, we are fully aware of all the legal aspects of this issue. That is why we applied for membership instead of claiming continuation of membership. What we would like to emphasize, however, is the specific character of this application. Czechoslovakia - Slovakia then being part of it - was a member of the Conference on Disarmament from its very beginning, and, in all modesty, I am glad to say it was an active member.

We highly appreciate the position of the Conference on Disarmament members that are ready to respond positively to our application. Equally attentively, we have taken note of those that have problems with it. Yet we believe that with realistic political goodwill they still could and should support Slovakia's admission to the Conference on Disarmament. We are sure it would positively influence the work of the Conference. I assure the Committee that Slovakia is committed to playing an active and constructive role in it.

Mr. ANSARI (India): We welcome the present resumed session of the First Committee, which is being convened in accordance with decision 47/422 of 9 December 1992, with the purpose of reassessing the respective roles of the multilateral arms control and disarmament machinery. The intervening period has enabled delegations to give serious attention to this question.

Paragraph (b) of decision 47/422 also provides for consideration of the Secretary-General's report entitled "New Dimensions of Arms Regulation and Disarmament in the Post-Cold War Era" at reconvened meetings of the First Committee, such as this resumed session. Time constraints, however, will prevent me from giving the report's contents the detailed analysis that they deserve. My Government has already provided its views on the report, as contained in document A/47/887 of 17 February 1993. This also addresses the question of regional disarmament, which has been raised in today's discussion.

Regional disarmament has its value in the context of achieving global disarmament, but any consideration of specific proposals must come about as a result of full agreement between the countries of the region concerned. The proposal must also take into account the specific characteristics of the region and the differing threat perceptions of individual countries. This is especially relevant when defining the geographical scope of a "region". Unfortunately, the proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia is flawed on many counts. In speaking of regional disarmament, it would be equally important to speak of measures to stem the tide of illicit arms transfers and its unholy nexus with trans-border terrorism and secessionism, which poses an even greater danger to international peace and security.

(Mr. Ansari, India)

The division of labour between different parts of the disarmament machinery was carefully crafted and defined at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The present disarmament machinery, in our opinion, is adequate to deal with the tasks at hand. The difficulty in making progress on some of the priority areas of disarmament, notably nuclear disarmament has little to do with the present machinery. The three multilateral disarmament bodies - the Conference on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission and the General Assembly - have distinct yet complementary, interrelated functions. The central issue is how best to rationalize the work of these three bodies to ensure that each singly contributes, and the three in combination contribute, as effectively as possible to the promotion of global cooperative security.

In this context, we could do no better than to go by the 1990 consensus report of the Disarmament Commission on the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament, as stated in the report, has a unique character and importance as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating body, and it is important that it continue to discharge its substantive responsibilities. In this context, we do not think that it would be appropriate for the Conference on Disarmament to take on the role of the permanent review and supervisory body for some existing multilateral arms-regulation and disarmament agreements.

The expansion of the Conference on Disarmament should not adversely affect its negotiating role. Any expansion should be carefully considered and implemented in an equitable manner. With the end of the cold war, the old formula of political balance is no longer valid, and no new formula has yet fully emerged. On this question, the need for consensus and the preservation

(Mr. Ansari, India)

of the Conference on Disarmament's negotiating role are of the utmost importance.

All matters of concern in the disarmament and international security fields could be adequately covered under the existing disarmament machinery. However, in some cases there is an overlap of subjects either as a whole or in part. For example, there exists at present a considerable overlap between the deliberations in the Disarmament Commission and those in the First Committee, leading to suggestions that the role of the Disarmament Commission itself should be reviewed.

An enhanced role for the Security Council in the field of disarmament has been recommended. In approaching this issue, it must be borne in mind that at present disarmament is not on the Security Council's agenda. Moreover, the Security Council already has a heavy agenda arising out of threats to international peace and security. In view of the fact that we have the Conference on Disarmament and a number of bodies of the General Assembly already dealing with disarmament, it may not be necessary to burden the Security Council any further. The Charter clearly affirms the General Assembly's role in the formulation of principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments. This role should be further reinforced and developed rather than involve other organs with limited memberships in disarmament questions.

(Mr. Ansari, India)

The forty-seventh session of the General Assembly witnessed a small restructuring of the work of the First Committee in the form of the merger of the general debate on disarmament and international security agenda items. While sanctioning this, we think it is important to bear in mind the need to preserve the intrinsic nature of the general debate as envisaged at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. While we are in favour of a rational grouping of agenda items, the agenda must nevertheless continue to retain its traditional focus on disarmament and reflect the concerns of Member States.

My delegation has no objection to the reorganization of the First Committee, the Special Political Committee and the Fourth Committee into two Committees instead of the existing three. However, the issues that are transferred to the First Committee from other Committees should be those which have a direct bearing on either disarmament or international security. Whatever the configuration, the important thing will be to ensure that there is no overlap or redundancy.

On the proposed move of the Office of Disarmament Affairs to Geneva, my delegation would like to play a constructive and positive role, and it will be in a position to go along with the general consensus.

At this resumed session we will all have the benefit of listening to the views of delegations on the question of the reassessment of the role of the disarmament machinery and the issues raised in the report of the Secretary-General. These are questions that must be addressed after careful consideration in view of their far-reaching implications. The objective of this exercise should be to ensure a broader consensus and a broader congruence of views, leading ultimately to a more realistic and efficient functioning of the disarmament machinery.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): Like many other States represented here today, the United States has provided its views to the Secretary-General on his report on "New Dimensions on Arms Regulation and Disarmament in the Post-Cold War Era." Drawing on the United States national comments, I will highlight the key elements of the United States position as they relate to the specific purposes of this resumed session.

We welcome the Secretary-General's recognition in his report on "New Dimensions" of dramatic changes, and of the corresponding need for a new approach to questions of international peace, security and stability. The United States agrees that each State should carry out its own responsibilities for disarmament. As the Secretary-General points out, the argument advanced by some States that the major military Powers should disarm first is too often used to avoid practical measures.

Regarding multilateral arms-control and disarmament machinery, the United States agrees that such machinery should meet the realities and priorities of our time. The machinery should be capable of supporting effectively the objectives identified and agreed upon by the international community. Any reassessment of the United Nations disarmament machinery can be undertaken only in the context of a general appreciation of the current international security environment and its attendant arms-control dimensions. A common understanding in this regard has yet to be arrived at.

The effectiveness of any organizational machinery depends on how it is used. Unless Member States are determined to utilize the United Nations disarmament machinery in pursuit of realistic objectives, no reassessment of that machinery will help advance progress in disarmament. There are, however, certain steps that could be taken even now to rationalize and improve the existing machinery.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

The First Committee has already moved in the direction of integrating its deliberations on disarmament and international security questions. It should now take the next step and remove the artificial distinction between its disarmament and international security agendas. The agenda should also be consolidated so as to eliminate redundancy. Thus the results would be less time required for general debate; a reduced number of resolutions; and a consequent shortening of the First Committee's annual sessions.

The Disarmament Commission is operating under the reform arrangements it adopted in 1991. Its agenda should be limited to three items at any time, in order to be able to perform its functions in a deliberate and efficient manner. Its utility should be measured not by the number of items on its agenda, but by the substantive value of its product.

The United States supports the concept of a coordinated system which would allow the international community to address major disarmament issues promptly, flexibly and efficiently. We do not believe, however, that coordination requires the creation of some overall umbrella organization. Rather, as I have suggested, we should seek better rationalization and greater efficiency of the existing elements of the disarmament machinery. The review of arms-control and disarmament treaties is the function of the parties to such treaties and not of an extra-treaty body or organization.

The United Nations Office of Disarmament Affairs has been performing its functions in a most commendable manner, despite the fact that some of its personnel have been detailed elsewhere in the Secretariat. Given the increased workload of that Office resulting from various actions by the General Assembly, in particular the establishment of the United Nations conventional arms Register, its staff should be restored to the full complement that now exists in theory but not in fact.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

On the possible move of the Office of Disarmament Affairs to Geneva, the United States believes that this Office should remain in close touch with other relevant elements of the Secretariat. To do otherwise would be inconsistent with the Secretary-General's emphasis on integrating disarmament issues into the broader structure of the international peace and security agenda. Thus, both substantively and in terms of its location, this office should remain in New York. For these reasons, the United States opposes a move from New York. While the United States is a strong advocate of United Nations streamlining and rationalization, such changes should enhance - not detract from - the United Nations ability to support important work under way.

As regards the Conference on Disarmament, an autonomous body which emerged from an agreement reached among its Member States in 1978, it is currently engaged in a self-generated review. The status of that review is the subject of a communication from the Conference to the Chairman of the First Committee. We look forward to the early resolution among Conference on Disarmament members of the important issues under consideration. These issues include updating the Conference's agenda and agreeing on a limited expansion of its membership consistent with the political-military realities of the present day.

The United States finds value in this timely discussion and looks forward to charting a consensus way forward.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

Just one additional remark, which is provoked by the discordant and irrelevant remarks of the representative of North Korea a half-hour ago. The slander we heard of the United States and a few of its close Asian allies represents abuse of this forum for base polemical purposes. Such a sad spectacle occurs at a time when we are discussing how to improve the disarmament machinery, for example, by admitting new members to the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. PEREZ VILLANUEVA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): Pursuant to decision 47/422 adopted by the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly of 9 December of last year, the First Committee has resumed its meetings this week with a view to engaging in an assessment of the entire multilateral arms-control and disarmament machinery. Following that assessment, we shall naturally have to try to agree upon concrete measures to rectify possible shortcomings and in any event to improve the functioning of those organs if necessary.

The Secretary-General, as we know, drafted a report on 23 October of last year, and Spain wishes to express its deepest thanks, not only for its timeliness but also for the thought-provoking ideas it contains. Spain looks forward with great interest to hearing the statement of the Secretary-General to this Committee tomorrow morning.

The ideas and views of the European Community's member countries are expressed in its presidential statement of 11 November 1992 before this Committee and in a document dated 29 January of this year. This morning, the Community once again made a presidential statement that completes the analysis of Community members on the purpose and suggestions contained in the report of the Secretary-General mentioned earlier.

(Mr. Pérez Villanueva, Spain)

Spain naturally endorses all of the opinions contained in those two statements and in that Community document, and we fully associate ourselves with their contents.

I should like today, very briefly and concisely, to confine myself to expressing Spain's view on an aspect of our work in the days to come that for obvious reasons is of the utmost concern to my country. I shall refer naturally to the Conference on Disarmament and to the question of increasing its membership, that is to say, its expansion.

Quite recently, the Conference on Disarmament approved two documents, pursuant to a specific request addressed to it by the General Assembly in December of last year. Both documents were introduced this morning by the current President of the Conference, Mr. Deyanov, the representative of Bulgaria, and they are contained in document A/C.1/47/14.

The Conference itself, at the end of its last meeting last year, entrusted its President, Ambassador Servais of Belgium, to conduct consultations concerning the expansion and the agenda of the Conference. Ambassador Servais, on 8 December last year, held informal collective consultations to report on the results of his activities. Later, on 18 January this year, he made another report on the same matter to the plenary of the Conference.

More recently, Ambassador Amorim of Brazil announced, at the beginning of this year's first meeting of the Conference, his intention, as the new President, to appoint a Special Coordinator on the question of expansion and another on the agenda, all of this pursuant to the ongoing interest of the Conference on Disarmament in moving forward on both questions.

(Mr. Pérez Villanueva, Spain)

Today, consequently, it is Ambassador O'Sullivan who has the task of conducting consultations with a view to reaching agreement on a new proposal concerning the composition and expansion of the Conference on Disarmament as soon as possible.

Spain welcomes this new and dynamic process of renewal that the Conference has clearly embarked upon. All of the recent decisions and actions of the Conference with respect to its own expansion are clear signs that its members are aware of the overriding importance of resolving this longstanding question.

We do not have the slightest doubt as to the usefulness of the Conference in the present international context or on the imperative need for the international community to be able to rely on that multilateral negotiating forum, functioning by consensus, once the inadequacies of its agenda and the anachronistic character of its present composition have been rectified.

I recently had the opportunity to express these views before the plenary of the Conference. I also took that occasion to express my Government's view on the entirety of the defining characteristics of the Conference and on the causes, in our view, of the difficulties it now faces.

I shall not revert to those matters. This is not the appropriate forum. Moreover, this is not the right time, because, in Spain's view, this is an opportunity to emphasize areas of common ground, not of disagreement. We must accelerate the movement towards a viable, practical, just and balanced solution which today, by contrast with recent times, we believe has become possible.

Our ultimate conception of the Conference as a multilateral organ will at another time and place be weighed against the views of others, probably

(Mr. Pérez Villanueva, Spain)

following Spain's joining that body as a full-fledged member. Therefore we will not engage in polemics, knowing full well that the majority of the Conference members will disagree, although Spain knows that it has the support of virtually all the non-member countries.

Accordingly, in this spirit of cooperation and progress, allow me to emphasize a few points that, to Spain, are close to reaching, or have already reached, consensus. They are in any event shared by broad sectors of opinion, both among the member countries and those who aspire to become members.

First, the Conference is the sole permanent and multilateral negotiating forum, and it remains the only adequate organ for global negotiation via consensus with respect to arms regulation and disarmament.

Secondly, as a negotiating forum, the Conference on Disarmament must maintain a certain specific status with respect to the other United Nations organs dealing with disarmament. It must therefore continue to be in a position to remain the master of its own agenda and its own composition.

Thirdly, the Conference on Disarmament has begun a process of review, inter alia, of its composition, in order to ensure that it appropriately reflects reality and thus that it will be able to meet future requirements.

Fourthly, there is considerable support for the idea of a significant expansion in the number of members of the Conference on Disarmament, both among countries that are already members and those that aspire to be members.

Fifthly, the expansion of the Conference should be such as to permit satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of those countries that are interested in participating and that at present are barred from becoming full-fledged members, although they have formally requested this on repeated occasions.

(Mr. Pérez Villanueva, Spain)

That is the case for Spain and has been for many years.

The expansion, therefore, must be carried out with realistic criteria and should not in any event, we believe, be a source of dissatisfaction because of the frustrated aspirations of any country, something that would work to the discredit of the Conference itself.

In conclusion, the ideas I have just expressed are intended to convey a constructive and conciliatory spirit oriented towards a solution which, we hope, will be satisfactory to Spain's aspirations by the end of 1993.

Ms. RIVERA (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): On behalf of the delegation of Costa Rica, please allow us to congratulate the Chairman, and his colleagues in the Bureau, on the way in which they have been guiding the work of this Committee and to offer them our best wishes for success in directing its work in this resumed session. They can rest assured of my delegation's sincere support in carrying out their function.

On 9 December 1992, the General Assembly decided to resume the session of the First Committee to consider the international disarmament machinery and in particular the respective functions of the First Committee of the General Assembly, the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament and their interrelationship, as well as the function of the Office of Disarmament Affairs of the United Nations.

We feel that with the end of the cold war, there have been changes which have promoted the development of the disarmament process and the process of arms limitation in the world and that it is now the appropriate moment to strengthen the functions of the existing disarmament machinery. To achieve this, we feel that it is important to recall the functions of its bodies.

The First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly is the deliberative body, worldwide in scope, which determines the priorities among the subjects to be considered in the field of disarmament and international security and which promotes international norms in this area.

In recent years, this Committee has undergone a reform process characterized by a reduction in the number of resolutions, a broader consensus on them and the merging of the debates on disarmament and international security.

(Ms. Rivera, Costa Rica)

We have been pleased to see an increase in the exchanges of views and a greater cooperation among the Member States in this new era of international relations; and we feel, therefore, that this is the appropriate time to include new disarmament issues of relevance in today's world which could lead to the elaboration of guidelines towards the strengthening of regional and international peace and security.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission is another deliberative body which offers participation to all States Members of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, in the formulation of principles, guidelines and proposals on disarmament matters to be adopted by consensus, and it complements and gives impetus to the disarmament negotiations which are carried out in other multilateral, regional or bilateral forums.

We agree that this deliberative body should have reorganized its work, and we support the decision to focus on specific issues, for we feel it is necessary to include timely subjects such as those that have been proposed in order to further the work of the Commission. We hope that at its next session a balanced, three-item agenda can be established.

My delegation believes that we should encourage pre-session consultations so that the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission can result in specific recommendations.

The Conference on Disarmament is the international community's multilateral body for disarmament negotiations; and it has also decided to begin a reassessment of its agenda, including, in particular, a review of its working methods and the size of its membership. We hope that in the near future greater involvement and participation of States in this multilateral forum will be achieved.

(Ms. Rivera, Costa Rica)

My delegation is pleased to see the capacity this forum has demonstrated in its finalization of work on the chemical weapons convention which, we feel, opens up promising prospects in the not-too-distant future for reaching agreement on nuclear disarmament on the basis of the suspension of nuclear tests and the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and their deployment.

We would also like to highlight the excellent work of the United Nations Office of Disarmament Affairs, which has provided substantive services and assistance to the First Committee of the General Assembly, the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the Register of Conventional Arms, international conferences on disarmament, expert groups and other subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly, as well as its work with regard to the dissemination of information and its educational activities in the field of disarmament.

We are concerned at the current trend in the Secretariat to reduce the staff of the Office of Disarmanent Affairs; this will tend to have negative repercussions on our work in the broad field of disarmament. We feel that this body should be maintained and strengthened as a Secretariat coordination centre in the field of disarmament and that it should be given the staff and other resources it needs to fully carry out its functions.

In conclusion, my delegation considers that the work we do and the efforts and decisions we make at this session will make us participants in building a world of peace, security and cooperation.

Mr. KALPAGE (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka welcomes the opportunity presented by the resumed session of the First Committee to address the issues of arms control and disarmament.

(Mr. Kalpagé, Sri Lanka)

We thank the Secretary-General and congratulate him for his report, in which he seeks to analyse the new dimensions of arms control and disarmament in the coming years. My delegation broadly agrees with the conceptual basis suggested by the Secretary-General, namely, integration, globalization and revitalization as a suitable thematic framework to address the substance as well as the methodology of future work in the field of arms control and disarmament.

Sri Lanka and other non-aligned countries have long advocated that international peace and security should be considered in an integrated manner. This conviction is derived from the harsh reality that for the vast majority of developing countries, the socio-economic constraints of underdevelopment represent the gravest danger to their security. Environmental degradation has added another dimension to non-military threats to international peace and security.

The United Nations should therefore take an integrated approach to international peace and security by addressing not only its military aspects but also its socio-economic development aspects. The vast outlays that will be required to successfully conclude the current efforts of the United Nations in preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peace-keeping and post-conflict peace-building can be lasting investments only if they are made sustainable through coordinated work.

(Mr. Kalpagé, Sri Lanka)

Sri Lanka has all along supported the globalization of the disarmament process. It has been our consistent policy to give primacy to multilateral diplomacy in ensuring an equitable and secure world order. We also believe that the global approach to arms control and disarmament should be complemented and augmented by regional and subregional initiatives in the fields of confidence-building, transparency, arms control and disarmament.

We should not forget the unresolved questions that have remained on our traditional agenda for some time. The historic agreements between the United States and the States of the former Soviet Union have considerably reduced the nuclear threat and paved the way for further progress in this area. However, the nuclear threat has assumed a different dimension as a result of the diffusion of the ownership of nuclear weapons and the issues of so-called latent proliferation.

The urgency of initiating multilateral negotiations on a nuclear test ban is more visible now, in view of environmental considerations and in the context of the heightened concerns with regard to the new risks of nuclear proliferation.

As a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which now has 150 States parties, Sri Lanka has a strong political commitment to strengthening that important international instrument and making it last. It constitutes an indispensable element of the international non-proliferation regime. We realize, however, that NPT is not a panacea for all nuclear or security ills. It can achieve only what it is designed to achieve, as a stepping stone to a larger process of disarmament as envisaged in Article VI of that Treaty.

(Mr. Kalpagé, Sri Lanka)

In the revitalization of our agenda, the Secretary-General has rightly pointed to a disturbing phenomenon. The illicit arms trade between the so-called private arms dealers and irregular groups is proliferating. The world scene today is a tragic reminder of the consequences of this illicit arms trade, which is driving a large number of conflicts in many democratic countries. Whilst the majority of the victims of these conflicts are in the developing world, some of the developed countries have not been spared either. The General Assembly has already recognized the gravity of this problem and has adopted a resolution which established the United Nations arms Register. This is clearly a most urgent security issue on the post-cold-war multilateral agenda. Its destabilizing manifestations are visible in almost all regions of the world. Strong financial interests seem to propel this illicit arms trade. Moreover, the illicit arms trade, drug trafficking and terrorism are often interrelated and function internationally in a vicious circle of mutual support.

With regard to the methodologies or the machinery required to address this daunting agenda of the post-cold-war period, we agree with the Secretary-General that a reassessment of the existing machinery would be in order. My delegation feels that the present methodologies have no inherent or fundamental flaws but can be made more responsive to current realities by their agendas and methods of work being reviewed.

The First Committee and the United Nations Disarmament Commission have a useful and functional role in providing forums for deliberation at the policy level so that necessary political direction can be given to United Nations work in the field of security and disarmament. Beyond that, we see the First Committee as the main forum for political discussions in which trends of

(Mr. Kalpagé, Sri Lanka)

common interests and concerns can be identified for action in a more focused way for both deliberative and negotiating purposes. The Disarmament Commission has traditionally provided specialized focus to identified issues so that further common ground can be developed and principles identified on a given issue of common interest and concern.

It is natural that there could be some overlap in these two deliberative forums, and indeed in other committees of the General Assembly which deal with political issues. It would perhaps be too simplistic to find institutional solutions to these essentially political questions of integration by disbanding one institution in favour of another. My delegation remains open and flexible on this issue.

We are happy to note that the cold-war-related apprehensions about the relevance and competence of the Conference on Disarmament no longer exist. The Conference has demonstrated its competence and dynamism by successfully concluding the most comprehensive international disarmament instrument of the past decade, namely, the Convention on chemical weapons. We strongly feel that the Conference should be supported and continue as the single multilateral negotiating forum.

We have always supported wider participation in the Conference on Disarmament, keeping in minl the necessity of maintaining a functional size commensurate with its negotiating mandate. The membership of the Conference should be expanded, taking into account the current realitites of political balance. We do not see the need for a new exercise for a "new composition" of the Conference based primarily on the criterion of the military significance of States. In an era in which security is sought by multilateral means and through political action, it is essential that the Conference on Disarmament,

(Mr. Kalpagé, Sri Lanka)

as the single multilateral negotiating body, be truly representative of all interests of the world community and be based on the sovereign equality of States. The composition of this negotiating body should therefore reflect this political axiom. Otherwise, its output may lack universal appeal and negate the very purpose of multilateral negotiations.

Mr. COLLINS (Ireland): The representative of Denmark spoke earlier in this debate on behalf of the European Community and its member States. I associate myself with his remarks. The views submitted by the European Community and its member States to the Secretary-General and in the Working Paper submitted this morning represent, in greater detail than I can set forth here, my delegation's views on the issues before us.

This resumed session of the First Committee has been convened for the purpose of considering the report (A/C.1/47/7) entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era", issued by the Secretary-General on 27 October 1992, which was the subject of an initial debate in the First Committee on 11 November 1992. The focus since then, as can be discerned from a glance at the Secretary-General's report prepared for this resumed session of the First Committee, has been on the issue of machinery, that is, the role and working methods of the three main disarmament bodies: the First Committee, the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament.

Allow me to begin by quoting Under-Secretary-General Yasushi Akashi, speaking in another context in 1991, on the general desirability of including all States in the multilateral disarmament process:

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

"What brings us together is a shared conviction that multilateral arms limitations and disarmament offer a gateway to a more peaceful, secure world. Very few of the enduring security problems of the past and very few of the emerging ones facing the world today can be solved without the coordinated actions of large numbers of States. Thus, multilateralism is not some lofty Utopian goal; it is not a favour that strong States offer to weak ones; and, above all, it cannot be regarded as an option that we pursue at our leisure. Rather, multilateralism has become an urgent necessity - one that must engage the creative energies of all States." (Disarmament, A Periodic Review by the United Nations, Volume XIV, Number 2, 1991, p. 33)

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

It is the task of the international community, through the multilateral disarmament forums, to debate, persuade, recommend and, eventually in appropriate areas, to negotiate the conditions in which States will perceive that they have the necessary assurance of security with international support to enable them to engage in measures of disarmament.

It is a truism to say that the disarmament machinery must be adapted to the achievement of the policy objectives we have set ourselves. The priorities, as far as my delegation is concerned, include the ultimate goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons; and, specifically, a comprehensive test-ban treaty has been a cornerstone of our disarmament policy. While sympathetic to the views of others on the machinery to be used to achieve a comprehensive test-ban treaty, we have always thought that it could best be achieved in the Conference on Disarmament.

A second main objective of my delegation's disarmament policy relates to the urgent need to address the issue of excessive accumulation of conventional weapons. In this context, Ireland has proposed a code of conduct on arms transfers. We have in mind - and I stress this - a set of politically binding principles and criteria, rather than a binding agreement on force levels and arms holdings.

As I have said, our attitude to the machinery of disarmament must reflect the necessities imposed by our policy objectives and by the reality of the world as it is. Reality will dictate, for example, that some issues are not ripe at any given moment for formal binding negotiations or agreements. This may be the case, perhaps, with the code of conduct on arms transfers to which I have just referred. In that sense, one can identify two broad stages in the

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

disarmament process, which I base on a more detailed, six-stage proceses identified by Under-Secretary-General Yasushi Akashi in 1991. The first is a deliberative, agenda-setting or guidelines stage, for which the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission are the primary vehicles; the second stage is a treaty-making phase, for which the Conference on Disarmament is the unique multilateral body.

I do not suggest that the process is always as clean and ordered as the schema I have just mentioned. No doubt there is an element of deliberation in the work of the Conference on Disarmament - that is as it should be. There is equally a pre-negotiating - for want of a better word - dimension to the work of the deliberative body of our Organization, the Disarmament Commission. The two bodies are, however, and must remain, distinct in their respective roles, the Conference on Disarmament continuing to be the single multilateral negotiating body and the Disarmament Commission being a deliberative body. It seems to my delegation that the Disarmament Commission, given the programme of reform undertaken in 1990 and further reforms under consideration, works roughly as a deliberative body should. There is a certain amount of wide-ranging general debate, which some have tended to view as untidineses and/or duplication. That is probably the price to be paid for a serious deliberative body.

As far as the First Committee is concerned, my delegation draws attention to the proposals put forward this morning in the working paper presented by Denmark on behalf of the European Community and its member States. The report of the Secretary-General makes specific mention of the need for reform of the Conference on Disarmament. In particular, the report opined, inter alia, that

> "a comprehensive approach is needed to address the structure ... of the Conference on Disarmament". (A/C.1/47/7, para. 45)

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

The report also suggests that the

> "efforts of the Conference on Disarmament might be focused on well-defined and urgent issues". (ibid.)

We are pleased to note that the Conference is considering the issue of expanding its membership. My delegation has long believed that the Conference should increase its membership and focus, as the Secretary-General suggests, "on well-defined and urgent issues". As an indication of our commitment to the Conference and to its important role in the schema of disarmament machinery, Ireland applied for membership of the Conference in 1982. We believe that the nature of the issues which the Conference must now address - non-proliferation especially - concern and involve many countries. The present composition of the Conference, as has been remarked here this morning, and put most clearly by the representative of Sweden, "reflects a bipolar world system that no longer exists". (A/C.1/47/PV.41, p. 66)

The issues facing the international community in the international arena, together with the new international security situation, make a convincing case for an urgent substantial enlargement of the Conference on Disarmament. May I say in conclusion that my country considers itself, given its history in the disarmament arena, eminently qualified to contribute to that task.

Mr. WLOSOWICZ (Poland): Poland welcomes the opportunity to address during this resumed session of the First Committee the question of disarmament in the new international environment and the role of the United Nations in this field. We are of the view that the Secretary-General's report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" has been very helpful in generating a comprehensive review of a disarmament agenda and its necessary adjustment to the present realities, requirements and challenges. We generally endorse the main thrust of this report.

(Mr. Wlosowicz, Poland)

In particular, Poland shares the approach advocating integration of disarmament into the broader context of international cooperative undertakings to attain international peace and security. Effective disarmament cannot be achieved in isolation from efforts aimed at the establishment of a new system of international security. For that reason, Poland strongly suports the principle of integration of disarmament while preserving its identity.

We are in full accord with the Secretary-General that the United Nations system and international organizations in general should play a more significant role also in respect to the globalization of disarmament. Indeed, this principle is consistent with a general desire of the international community - to show special interest in the universalization of disarmament agreements and efforts and the enhancement of the multilateral approach. National security in today's interrelated world cannot be confined to the immediate neighbourhood, even on regional and subregional levels. An obvious example of this is the non-proliferation Treaty and the need for its universalization. May I, in this respect, renew the appeal to those States still outside the Treaty, and in particular the States that emerged from the former Soviet Union, to accede to the Treaty as non-nuclear States without delay. At the same time, we fully recognize the importance of interaction between regional and global disarmament. Europe has a long list of outstanding achievements in building a new military order on its continent. The new military order is based on four principles: openness and transparency of military efforts, refraining from threatening activities, limitation of armed forces, and continuous security dialogue. It could constitute a source of inspiration for efforts undertaken on a global level. On the other hand, the regional mechanism should be effectively used to enhance the global disarmament process.

(Mr. Wlosowicz, Poland)

Another important principle set out in the Secretary-General's report is that of revitalization. Poland subscribes to the view that we have an important legacy of disarmament and arms-control agreements providing a solid framework for furthering the disarmament and arms-control process today; we should build upon it. It is also evident that the traditional disarmament agenda needs to be reviewed to take into account the requirements and challenges - and the new opportunities - of the post-cold-war era.

We are encouraged by the progress already made in that respect. The response of the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Conference on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee itself shows that multilateral disarmament is keeping pace with the realities. While weapons of mass destruction continue to be in the forefront of multilateral efforts, new emphasis should be given to such priority items as the non-proliferation of all weapons - in particular nuclear weapons - and transparency in armaments and arms transfers and other confidence-building measures. It is in such areas that we see the potential of those bodies for self-adaptation.

This leads me to the main agenda item for this resumed session: the review of the existing disarmament machinery and an analysis of ways and means for increasing its efficiency and effectiveness.

Poland welcomes the reports presented on this subject by the Conference on Disarmament, and we fully support their conclusions. In particular, we are strongly in favour of preserving the role of the Conference as the sole multilateral global negotiating body on disarmament. With the Conference's adoption of its programme of work for 1993 and its focus on well-defined,

(Mr. Wlosowicz, Poland)

urgent issues, fears that there was no future for the Conference after the conclusion of the chemical-weapons Convention have been effectively dispelled. The process needs to be consolidated, and we are confident that the Conference will live up to expectations. We share the view that the process should be conducted carefully and that decisions should not be forced upon the Conference without giving it a chance to examine its own work.

The accumulated experience of the Conference on Disarmament was remarkably enriched during the process of negotiating the chemical-weapons Convention, and its negotiating ability and potential should be preserved. It is from that perspective that we view the question of expanding the membership of the Conference. Poland would support the approach of a limited expansion. We are aware of the strong desire of many countries to become members of that body. We should be responsive to such legitimate aspirations without undermining the negotiating effectiveness of the Conference on Disarmament. We should also try to find a better mechanism for involving non-member States in the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

We are also encouraged by the experience of the Disarmament Commission to date with its new, reformed work. Time is needed to see to what extent and in what way that body can better serve the international disarmament process. One suggestion that might be considered in that context relates to making better use of the time available between the Commission's organizational session in December and its regular session in May. This could be used, for example, for the preparation and distribution, well in advance, of appropriate working papers for early consideration in capitals and for subsequent discussion and adoption by the Disarmament Commission.

(Mr. Wlosowicz, Poland)

The First Committee continues to play an important role in carrying out an exchange of views and in developing recommendations on disarmament and international-security issues. The process of rationalization has continued for more than a decade and has accelerated in recent years owing to transformations in the international system; it has increased the effectiveness of the Committee. Combining the debates on disarmament and security items is the latest example.

However, there is still room for further improvement. First of all, it seems advisable to discontinue the practice of taking action on each set of items separately. Further efforts could be focused, inter alia, on: rationalizing the Committee's agenda with a view to overcoming the sometimes artificial dispersion of related items and to clustering them appropriately; expanding and better structuring the phase in which specific agenda items are considered, with the simultaneous reduction of the time allotted for general debate; and the possibility of taking action on draft resolutions at the conclusion of consideration of an item, especially where draft resolutions enjoy general support or where there is a well-established voting pattern.

In our overall review of the disarmament machinery we must not omit the Office of Disarmament Affairs. A sound organizational structure and adequate staff are crucial not only for the efficient functioning of other elements of the multilateral disarmament machinery - namely the First Committee, the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission - but also for carrying out tasks and functions entrusted directly to it. The undisturbed operation of the Register of Conventional Arms and the exchange of information

(Mr. Wlosowicz, Poland)

under confidence-building measures related to the biological-weapons Convention depend to a large degree on the ability of the Office of Disarmament Affairs to cope with those challenging tasks.

Since the report of the Secretary-General on new dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament envisages even more tasks for that Office, appropriate measures in terms of staff and resources are required to ensure smooth and efficient functioning.

In conclusions, I would like to stress our support for the notion that there is a need for a coordinated system which would allow the international community to address major disarmament problems promptly, flexibly and efficiently. Achieving that goal does not necessarily involve the establishment of a new machinery. We are in favour of examining existing bodies and organs, their structures, functions, methods of work and working agendas. It should be a detailed and careful examination guided by the main criteria of their relevance and potential for dealing effectively with the requirements of the post-cold-war disarmament agenda and of their ability to adapt to present circumstances.

Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): At the First Committee's special meeting held during the main part of the forty-seventh session, my delegation offered preliminary comments on the report of the Secretary-General entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era". After a more careful analysis of the report and in the light of General Assembly decision 47/422 of 9 December 1992, in accordance with which we have resumed our work and which invited Member States to submit their views on this item, the Government of the Republic of Cuba submitted its reply to the Secretary-General, which is to be found in document document A/47/887.

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

In that light, and as a contribution to the successful outcome of our session under the timetable proposed by the Chairman, my delegation wishes to make a few brief comments on the matters before us: the reassessment of the multilateral disarmament machinery and the roles and interrelation of its various constituent bodies.

In our view, we must first and foremost start with the premise that the present machinery was established by consensus, with the full agreement of all States Members of the United Nations as of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978.

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

Let us not forget that, at that time, there still prevailed the tension and division arising from the cold war climate then characterizing international relations and which no doubt exercised an influence upon our Organization and thus upon multilateral efforts in the sphere of disarmament. The end of confrontation and military bipolarity and the essential elimination of the tension ensuing therefrom should make it possible to lend significant new impetus and revitalized political will to the task of achieving the aspirations in arms control and disarmament to which the international community has aspired for many years, including nuclear disarmament and the total and definitive cessation of nuclear testing.

It is from that general perspective that my delegation approaches the efforts that we must make at this time to re-evaluate the existing multilateral disarmament machinery. Specifically, our considerations concerning the current organs of this machinery and their interrelationship, and the manner in which we should envisage their future activity, can be outlined as follows.

First, concerning the role and responsibilities of the General Assembly in the sphere of arms control and disarmament, we believe that it should continue to be the principal deliberative body for multilateral discussions. The General Assembly, a democratic organ par excellence in which all States Members of the Organization are represented, should continue to consider the principles governing disarmament and arms control issues and to adopt recommendations to that effect.

Secondly, the Security Council already plays a concrete role in arms control and disarmament, and we do not believe that it is necessary or desirable to expand the responsibilities of that organ in this sphere. We

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

must bear especially in mind that disarmament measures adopted as a result of a negotiating process between various States tend to reflect the sovereign desire of those States to eliminate or limit a type or category of arms systems, particularly those that are considered possible threats to regional or international peace and security. Under no circumstances can the negotiating process be imposed by any organ of the United Nations, especially the Security Council.

Thirdly, the First Committee should continue to focus its attention exclusively on all the disarmament and international security issues allocated to it. Although some advances have been made in past years in the rationalization of its work, we should endeavour to improve and further refine that work in order that the First Committee might achieve even more successful results. Accordingly, we are prepared to consider favourably any ideas directed towards that end. We wish to stress, however, that other items - items unrelated to the present subject - should not be added, since that would surely contribute to diluting our work, which, with the end of the cold war, has the potential to gain greater impetus.

Fourthly, as to the Conference on Disarmament, we have the two documents it prepared and adopted by consensus. Not only are those documents the fruits of the efforts of the respective Chairmen of that organ for January and February, and of the consultations held under their stewardship, but they also provide a very useful evaluation of those consultations concerning the item on re-evaluating the multilateral machinery. My delegation shares the view that we should maintain the special status of that organ, which should continue to be the multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament, having a limited membership, adopting its decisions by consensus, and maintaining its

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

established link with the General Assembly in reporting upon its work. A process is under way in that forum aimed at refining its work and reappraising its agenda, composition and methods of work. Cuba welcomes this effort and our delegation to the Conference will make its contribution. Clearly, the present membership of the Conference leaves room for improvement, and we are prepared to exchange views on its expansion. The focus, however, should be on improvement rather than restructuring.

Fifthly, the Disarmament Commission has thus far played an important role as a deliberative body of the General Assembly, charged with considering a variety of problems of particular relevance to arms control and disarmament prior to conditions being ripe for initiating a multilateral negotiating process. Precisely because it is an organ open to all States Members of the United Nations and because of its deliberative character, and especially following the improvements introduced to enhance its work, the Disarmament Commission should, in my delegation's view, continue to operate - although additional measures may have to be adopted to enable it to fulfil its responsibilities with greater efficiency.

Sixthly, in as much as the United Nations Secretariat bears the important responsibility of attending to the requirements of the disarmament machinery, it should be given all due support. Following the special session of 1978, its structures were strengthened to enable the Secretariat to perform the tasks entrusted to it at that time. Recently, however, as a result of changes wrought by the Secretary-General, the Secretariat staff has been reduced not only in rank but in number. There is even the persistent rumour that the Office of Disarmament Affairs may be transferred to Geneva. My delegation is of the view that the United Nations structure should have the staffing and

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

hierarchical rank commensurate with the important activity that the United Nations is being called upon to carry out in this sphere. Even if no actual proposal has been made to transfer the Office to Geneva, it should be borne in mind that disarmament activities are essentially and by definition political; hence they should be part and parcel of the political structures of the Organization, which are based at Headquarters.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker. The Committee has thus concluded its general exchange of views on the issues before it.

I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

I would, however, remind them of the following rule of procedure by which the Committee will be guided. The number of interventions in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation at a given meeting should be limited to two per item. The first intervention in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation on any item at a given meeting should be limited to 10 minutes, and the second intervention should be linited to five minutes.

Mr. TANAKA (Japan): I wish simply to state that the reference to my country by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is totally unfounded and irrelevant to our present agenda.

Mr. YOO (Republic of Korea): A while ago, the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, deviating from the subject we are considering and from the constructive atmosphere of discussion, made some inaccurate references regarding the policy of my Government on nuclear issues.

It is inappropriate for me to go into detail on a question which is being discussed at the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna. However, for the sake of the record, I should like to mention that the policy and the facts related to this policy - as enunciated in the presidential declaration of the Republic of Korea of 1990 and as expressed in a subsequent agreement between the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in 1992 on the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula - remain unchanged. This will correct all points of inaccuracy in the statement of the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Mr. PAK (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I should like to mention, with regard to the statement of my colleague from south Korea concerning the nuclear question on the Korean peninsula, that it is necessary to remember that the nuclear question on the Korean peninsula derives from the deployment of nuclear weapons in south Korea by the United States. Accordingly, if the South Korean authorities are truly interested in the solution of the nuclear question, they should regularly open up United States nuclear weapons and nuclear bases in south Korea and demand their withdrawal.

May I also recall one other thing. As for the development of nuclear weapons by south Korea, I will not touch upon it owing to the limited time. A

(Mr. Pak, Democratic People's Republic of Korea)

memorandum from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the development of nuclear weapons by south Korea will be circulated as a document of the Security Council. It will be helpful for an understanding of the standard south Korea has achieved in its nuclear development.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the Committee's programme of work and timetable, and having concluded its general exchange of views, as of tomorrow the Committee will proceed to the next stage of its work, namely, consideration of the conclusions and recommendations that could later be reflected as necessary as a draft resolution or decision for the consideration and approval of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.